General History of the Christian Era

Guggenberger

WARSAW

CONCORDIA UNIVERSITY
3 4211 00111 6709

A GENERAL HISTORY

OF THE

CHRISTIAN ERA.

FOR CATHOLIC COLLEGES AND READING CIRCLES,
AND FOR SELF-INSTRUCTION.

VOL. II.

THE PROTESTANT REVOLUTION.

BY

A. GUGGENBERGER, S. J.

Professor of History at Canisius College, Buffalo, N. Y.

FOURTEENTH AND FIFTEENTH EDITIONS

B. HERDER BOOK CO.

17 South Broadway, St. Louis, Mo.,
and
33 Queen Square, London, W. C.
1925

KLINCK MEMORIAL LIBRARY
Concordia College
River Forest, IL 60305

Nihil Obstat.

JAMES A. ROCKLIFF, S. J.

Buffalo, N. Y., Feb. 15, 1901.

Copyrighted 1901, by
JOSEPH GUMMERSBACH.

93055
G

ABBREVIATIONS IN THE LISTS OF BOOKS FOR CONSULTATION.

A. C. Q. 9, 25. = American Catholic Quarterly. Vol. 9, p. 25.

D. R. '79; 1, 2, 3, 4. = Dublin Review. 1879. January, April, July, October.

M. '90; 1, 2, 3. = Month. 1890. Jan.-April, May-Aug., Sept.-Dec.

St. 40, 110. = Stimmen aus Maria Laach. Vol. 40, p. 110.

I. K. Z. '85. = Zeitschrift für kathol. Theologie, Innsbruck. 1885.

E. H. R. 10, p. 250. = English Historical Review. Vol. 10, p. 250.

E. R. '68; 1, 2, 3, 4. = Edinburgh Review. 1868. Jan., April, July, Oct.

Q. R. '91; 1, 2, 3, 4. = Quarterly Review. (London.) 1891. Jan., April, July, Oct.

C. T. S. P. = Catholic Truth Society Publications.

St. of N. S. = Story of Nations' Series.

H. P. B., v. 90, p. 112. = Historisch Politische Blätter. Vol. 90, page 112.

H. J-B. = Görres Gesellschaft: Historisches Jahrbuch.

BOOK I.

CAUSES OF THE PROTESTANT REVOLUTION — THE RENAISSANCE.

CHAPTER I.

THE EXILE OF THE PAPACY AND THE GREAT WESTERN SCHISM.

§ 1.

THE SUPPRESSION OF THE TEMPLARS.

1. Clement V., 1305–1314 — Transfer of the Papal Residence to Avignon. — A new period in the history both of the Church and of the State began in the latter years of the reign of Philip the Fair. The removal of the papal residence from Rome to southern France suddenly interrupted the course of development which had been going on for centuries in the relations between the Church and the State. A new condition of things was gradually substituted, in which the prestige of the Holy See sank to a lower level, the State became bolder in its encroachments on the rights of the Church, and revolutionary ideas and heretical doctrines grew apace with the revival of classical learning, which gave to the period the name of the Renaissance. But Divine Providence watching over the Holy See carried it through the storm of the times to new splendor and victories.

After the short Pontificate of Benedict XI., 1303–1304, Bertrand de Goth, Archbishop of Bordeaux, was elected, chiefly through the

influence of Philip the Fair. There existed, however, no bargain or preliminary agreement between the king and the Archbishop of Bordeaux. The Pope-elect assumed the name of Clement V. Shrinking from the troubles which the Italian factions were stirring up in Rome, Clement took his abode, first at Lyons, where he was crowned, and from 1309, at Avignon, a city on the Rhone, held by the kings of Naples as counts of Provence.

During the coronation procession at Lyons a falling wall killed Gailard de Goth, the Pope's brother, the duke of Brittany and other nobles, unhorsed the Pope and knocked the tiara from his head. It was under such auspices that the papal residence was for the next seventy years and more transferred from Rome to France. The Italians called this sojourn of the Popes at Avignon with some reason and much exaggeration the Babylonian exile of the Papacy. Clement V. was of a yielding disposition, and in many respects open to the influence of Philip the Fair. He not only abolished the Bull Clericis laicos, but removed from the other Bulls of Boniface VIII. all statements reflecting upon the acts of the king. He created nine French Cardinals, and granted for the next five years the use of the church tithes to the insatiate Philip, who during his reign received or appropriated 400,000,000 francs from the ecclesiastical property of France. With difficulty Clement evaded the royal demand to condemn Boniface VIII. as a heretic, whilst he gave pretty free scope to Philip in prosecuting the Order of the Templars whose immense wealth the greedy monarch coveted.

2. Arrest of the Knights Templars, 1307. — The Templars numbered at the time a standing army of 16,000 knights distributed among the chief countries of Europe. Their separate and independent organization was an object of dislike to an absolute monarch like Philip the Fair. They had sided with Boniface VIII., and had assisted in the expulsion of the French from Sicily. Besides, he owed them money, and on one occasion had been forced to seek a humiliating refuge in the Temple, their fortified residence, when the people had risen against a new scheme of oppressive taxation. Rumors of idleness, luxury and evil life had previously circulated, and several Popes and synods had censured the Templars for grave disorders. But now Philip's agents set to work systematically to spread charges of the most incriminating nature. Jacob of Molay, the grand-master, asked Clement V. for an investigation. By a secret order, however, and without consulting the Pope, Philip effected the arrest of Jacob of Molay and of all the Templars of France on one and the same day, and took possession of their property. Clement V. protested at first, but finally joined the king in calling upon all the princes of Europe to arrest the Templars and detain them in the name of the Holy See.

3. Trial of the Templars. — The Templars were tried before two distinct tribunals: the individual members before a court of inquisitors and French bishops, chiefly dependent on the king; the Order as such, its laws and usages, before a papal commission. In the former court the rack was freely used; the papal commission employed no tortures and ordered no executions. The king's inquisitors carried on the penal investigation for nearly two years before the papal commission began its hearings. In May, 1308, before any ecclesiastical decision had been given, a Parliament of the Three Estates at Tours condemned the Order and adjudged its members guilty of death.

Jacob of Molay and other superiors of the Order made incriminating confessions both before the inquisitorial and the papal commissions. There exists no contemporary evidence that Jacob of Molay was ever tortured. Templars who confessed were absolved; those who did not confess, or who revoked their confessions, were treated as obstinate heretics and handed over to the secular arm. Forty-five Templars thus condemned by a synod at Paris were burnt by the order of Philip (1310), seven others at Senlis. The number of executions at Paris gradually rose to 113. These executions accomplished the royal purpose of preventing an organized hearing before the Council of Vienne. Many of the Templars who had offered to defend the Order made haste to withdraw from the intended defense.

4. Result of the Investigations. — As to the result of the investigations in France before both commissions, out of 510 who were examined, 441 confessed denial of God or of Christ; 441, dishonoring the cross; 227, immoral practices; 20, the adoration of an idol. Many of them declared afterwards, that their confessions had been wrung from them on the rack. On the other hand a great number of knights, among them seventy who were examined by the Pope himself, made confessions without being subjected to any torture. They maintained, however, while admitting personal guilt, that the Order as such was innocent. In Calabria, too, many confessions were obtained. In England the confessions were local and individual. In Castile and Aragon, in Germany, in the greater part of Italy and in the island of Cyprus the investigations were favorable to the Order. The fact that there were so many more cases of corruption unearthed in France than in other countries, is partly explained by the circumstance, that Albigensian heresies and practices had found their way into the houses of the Templars as they had into many other noble houses of southern France.

5. The Council of Vienne and the Suppression of the Order, 1311–1312. — The XV. General Council which Clement V. had summoned to decide on the affairs of the Templars met at Vienne in 1311. All the depositions of the Templars were placed before a numerous commission of prelates representing the different Catholic countries of Europe. The first question, "Can a judicial sentence of heresy be passed against the Order without further investigation," was answered by a declaration of four-fifths or five-sixths of the commission to the effect, that the judicial condemnation of the Order on the strength of the confessions heretofore made would be impossible without an offense of God and a violation of justice. Nearly half a year passed, before a final decision was given. Strongly urged by Philip the Fair, Clement at last chose a middle course, and decreed in the interest of public welfare, the dissolution of the Order by an administrative measure of discipline, "by way of apostolic provision" because the Order was at least suspected of heresy; the confessions obtained had sullied its reputation and made it odious to the Catholic world; respectable persons would no longer join the Order; its existence had become useless for the cause of the Holy Land; a longer delay might bring about the complete loss of its property, donated or willed for the defense of Christendom against the enemies of the cross.

6. **Death of Clement and Philip, 1314.** — Clement V. allowed the final decision on the fate of the highest dignitaries of the Order, which he had reserved to himself, to slip out of his hands. Accordingly Jacob of Molay and the Grand Visitor, after publicly asserting the innocence of the Order, were burnt on an island of the Seine. Philip IV. reaped the material gain of the measure. Whilst the trial was still in progress he wasted a large part of the property. In spite of the Bull by which Clement V. appointed the Knights of St. John heirs to the Templars, Philip retained the administration of the property till his death. He appropriated 500,000 livres, for which he had been indebted to the Templars. The Knights of St. John had to pay him 260,000 livres for costs and pretended claims against the Templars. When the Knights of St. John obtained possession under Louis X., the king kept one-half of the movable property and of the church treasure for himself. The property of the Templars was similarly dealt with by the rulers in England and other countries.

Both Clement V. and Philip the Fair died in 1314. The Pope left a College of Cardinals numbering eight Italians and fifteen Gascons or French-

men. Philip's memory was so hateful that many of the clergy had to be compelled by force to celebrate his funeral service.

Books for Consultation. — R. Parsons, D. D.: *Studies*, vol. II., *Pope Boniface VIII.*, p. 411; *The Alleged Bargain of Pope Clement V. with Philip the Fair*, p. 435; *The Fifteenth General Council — Sequel of the Contest with Philip the Fair*, p. 446; *The Suppression of the Templars*, p. 454; *The Popes at Avignon*, p. 487. — Addison: *The Knights Templars.* — F. C. Woodhouse: *Military Religious Orders.* — Amy Grange: *The Fall of the Knights of the Temple;* D. R. '95, 4, p. 329. — Boutaric: *La France sous Philippe-le-Bel; Clement V., Philippe-le-Bel et les Templiers.* — Lavocat: *Procès des Frères et de l'ordre du Temple.* — Abbé Christophe: *Histoire de la Papauté pendant le XIV. Siècle*, vol. I. (French and German). — Loiseleur: *La Doctrine Secrète des Templiers.* — Dupuy: *Histoire de la condemnation des Templiers.* — B. Jungmann: *De Abolitione Ordinis Templariorum;* vol. VI., dissert. 31, pp. 78–149. — *Clemens V. und die Aufhebung des Templerorders*, I. K. Z., '81, pp. 1, 81, 389, 581. — Rattinger: *Die Aufhebung des Templerordens und die aeltesten geschichtlichen Zeugen;* St. v. 33, p. 482. — See also H. P. B., v. 9, p. 496. — Wilcke: *Geschichte des Ordens der Tempelherren.* — *The Bull of Suppression in Civiltà Catholica*, Aug. and Sept., 1866; *Tübinger Theol. Quartalschrift*, 1866. — *Documents in Michelet: Procès des Templiers.* — Hefele: C. G., v. VI. — Damberger, v. 12. — Hergenroether: K. G., v. 2, p. 8. — Alzog-Byrne: v. 2, p. 819. — Darras, vol. 3, p. 459. — *Revue des Questions historiques*, 1872, vol. 12, pp. 21–39.

§ 2.

THE EMPIRE FROM ADOLF OF NASSAU TO LUDWIG THE BAVARIAN.

7. Adolf of Nassau, 1292–1298. — After the death of Rudolf of Hapsburg the electors commissioned the Archbishop of Mainz to designate a successor. Passing over Albrecht, Rudolf's son, he appointed a kinsman, the powerless count Adolf of Nassau. The princes supported the king as long as he complied with their demands, but when he undertook to establish a dynastic power by warfare, purchase and the annexation of fiefs to the crown, and to assume an independent attitude, a number of electors deposed him at Mainz, and chose Albrecht of Austria. Adolf of Nassau fell at Goelheim near Worms in a cavalry fight with Albrecht, 1298.

8. Albrecht of Austria, 1298–1308.— Albrecht sought his support among the cities, which he favored in every way and united against the princes to enforce the peace of the land. He was a stern but just ruler, and the people had the benefit of his rule. The three Rhenish electors formed a league against the king, whose display of independence sorely disappointed them. Albrecht defeated the League, broke the castles of the insurgents, forced them to restore the crown domains, and abolishing the tolls opened the Rhine to free commerce. He was less fortunate in his wars with Meissen and Bohemia, undertaken to increase his dynastic power.

Albrecht I. fell the victim of a conspiracy of German princes, by the hand of his nephew John Parricida. From Albrecht sprang all the later dukes, kings and emperors of the House of Hapsburg or Austria.

9. Election of Henry VII, 1308–1313 — Disregarding the French attempts to capture the imperial crown, the German electors chose the high-minded Henry of Luxemburg as Henry VII. The king-elect took the usual oaths to Clement V. and was recognized as king of the Romans. Before crossing the Alps to restore, as he hoped, the splendor of the Holy Roman Empire, he laid the foundation for the greatness of his House in Bohemia. The dynasty of the Premyslides, who had ruled Bohemia nearly 600 years, had died out with Wenceslas III. Henry married his son John to Wenceslas' sister Elizabeth, invested him with the kingdom of Bohemia, and appointed him regent during his absence in Italy.

10. The State of Italy at the Beginning of the Fourteenth Century. — At the beginning of this period most of the free municipalities of Italy had given way to petty tyrannies, absolute government being wielded by some noble house. Milan and the Lombard cities were alternately ruled by the Guelfic Della Torre and the Ghibelline Visconti families. Mantua was swayed by the Gonzagas, Modena and Ferrara by the Estes, Rimini by the Malatestas. In Piedmont the counts of Savoy fought for supremacy with rival barons. In Rome the Ghibelline Colonnas and the Guelfic Orsinis filled the city with ruin and desolation in their contest for power. The kingdom of Naples was ruled by the House of Anjou, and Sicily by a side-line of the House of Aragon. Venice had become an oligarchy. The powers of the doge had passed over to the Great Council of 480 members who instead of the people henceforth elected the doge. In 1297 this body declared itself hereditary and in 1311 instituted the famous Council of Ten, who had unlimited power of arrest and punishment, and rendered any popular conspiracy impossible. Apart from minor towns the Republican form of government was still maintained in Genoa, the commercial rival of Venice, and in turbulent Florence, the stronghold of the Guelfic party. At the head of the popular government stood the "captain of the people." The provost of the guilds and the banner-bearers of justice had to watch over the "Ordinances of Justice," passed in 1293 which excluded nobles altogether from office. In the continued warfare of Guelfs and Ghibellines the victory of one party usually resulted in the expulsion from city or territory of every prominent man of the opposite faction.

11. Henry VII. in Italy, 1310–1313. — Henry VII. was at first well received in Italy by both the Guelfs and Ghibellines. Dante, the author of the Divina Comedia, the Ghibelline exile of Florence, greeted him as the savior of Italy. Milan gave him the Italian crown. But upon a rising of the Milanese the Guelfs were banished,

and the power of the Viscontis was secured by the appointment of Matteo as imperial vicar. The opposition of Florence induced Henry to assume the leadership of the Ghibellines. King Robert of Naples, the Pope's vicar for the Romagna, was the soul of the Guelfic opposition. Reaching Rome in 1312, and finding the Leonine city and the capitol in the hands of the Guelfs, Henry occupied the city proper, captured the Capitol, and received the imperial crown in the Lateran from three Cardinal Legates of Clement V. Failing in the siege of Florence after his coronation, the Emperor allied himself with Frederic, king of Sicily, and put Robert of Naples, who as count of Provence was his vassal, under the ban of the Empire for felony and rebellion. Clement V. took the part of Robert against the Emperor, and threatened excommunication. But before the allied forces could join, the Emperor died near Siena of a fever contracted in his camp at Brescia, 1313. The Empire being vacant, Clement V. appointed Robert of Naples imperial vicar for Italy during the vacancy.

12. Ludwig the Bavarian, 1314–1347, and Frederic of Austria, 1314–1330. — Fifteen months after the death of Henry VII. a double election resulted in the choice of Frederic of Austria and Ludwig the Bavarian, both grandsons of Rudolf of Hapsburg. Ludwig and Frederic received each two valid votes, but the two additional votes of Ludwig, and the one additional vote of Frederic were challenged by the princes as unlawful. Ludwig was crowned by the legal official, the Archbishop of Koeln, but at Bonn; Frederic was crowned in the legal coronation city at Aachen, but by the Archbishop of Mainz. Hence the claim of either king-elect was doubtful. But the tenacity with which both parties clung to their choice plunged Germany into a civil war. Of five encounters between the contestants only the last was decisive. At Ampfing on the Inn, 1322, the Austrian cause succumbed to the Bavarian claimant and Frederic became the prisoner of Ludwig. Henceforth Frederic's brother, Leopold of Austria, supported by John XXII., was the champion of the Austrian claims, and continued the war.

13. **John XXII. and the German Election.** — At the outbreak of the war, Pope John XXII., the successor of Clement V., admonished the pretenders and

the German princes to settle their dispute in peace. Both claimants rejected the contention of the Pope that before his decision neither was king of the Romans, but only king-elect (electus in regem). In accordance with this principle John, through his vicars, continued to exercise the rights of regency in Italy, as right and custom entitled him to do during a vacancy of the Empire. Under the public law then in force, a vacancy lasted from the death of the previous Emperor to the coronation of the succeeding one. At the same time the claimants, too, had appointed their own respective vicars. The revolt against the papal authority of a par y of Franciscan friars, previously condemned for heresy in a dispute about apostolic poverty, added a new element to the strife. The Fraticelli, as they were called, found a willing patron in Ludwig the Bavarian. Under their influence he inflicted on John XXII., the gravest insult which can be offered to the head of the Church; he charged him with heresy, and appealed to a General Council to sit in judgment on the Sovereign Pontiff. John excommunicated Ludwig as a usurper of imperial authority, and whilst confirming the rights of the German electors, declared that Ludwig had forfeited the kingdom. The measure added new strength to the Austrian party. At Burgau Ludwig had to flee in haste before Leopold of Austria, and thought it wise to grant Frederic a conditional release from prison. Frederic had to renounce his right to the kingdom, and to promise to gain over his party to the side of Ludwig. Failing to do so, Frederic voluntarily returned to his jailer, but was henceforth treated by Ludwig as a brother and co-regent. The claimants were reconciled, but not the parties. New summonses and censures of the Pope, fresh negotiations between Germany and Avignon, failed of effect. The death of Leopold of Austria, 1326, enabled Ludwig to transfer the contest to Italy.

Card. Hergenröther: *Catholic Church and Christian State from Rudolf of Hapsburg to Henry VII.*, v. 2, pp. 44–51; *Louis of Bavaria and Frederic of Austria*, pp. 52–60. — Creighton: *History of the Papacy during the Period of the Reformation*, v. 1, Introduction. — L. Leger: *Hist. of Austria.* — Coxe: *Hist. of the House of Austria.* — Pasquale-Linde Villari: *The First Two Centuries of Florentine History: The Republic and Parties of the Time of Dante.* — R. Parsons, D. D.: *On Dante*, vol. II., p. 508. — *Dante*, A. C. Q., v. 5, p. 715. — *The Age of Dante in the Florentine Chronicles*, D. R. '79, 4, p. 279. — R. W. Church: *Dante: an Essay.* — G. Procter; W. Hunt: *Hist. of Italy.* — J. F. André: *Histoire politique de la monarchie pontificale au XIV., siècle, ou la papauté à Avignon.* — Reumont: *Geschichte der Stadt Rom: Das babylonische Exil*, vol. 2, pp. 715–844. — C. Hoefler: *Aus Avignon: Almanack d. Kaiserl. Akademie d. Wissenschaften*, 21, pp. 233–285. — Wenck: *Clement V. und Heinrich VII.* — On *Henry VII.*, H. P. B., v. 36, p. 49; vol. 48, p. 591.

§ 3.

LUDWIG THE BAVARIAN AND THE COURT OF AVIGNON.

14. The Roman Expedition of Ludwig, 1327–1330.— In 1327 Ludwig crossed the Alps. The principal representatives of the ecclesiastical and political revolt gathered around him, among

them Michael Caesena, William Occam, the English controversialist, Marsiglio of Padua and John of Jandun, the joint authors of the Defender of Peace (Defensor Pacis).

In this and other books they spread doctrines implying a complete revolution of the existing order. By their doctrines they deserve to be regarded as the forerunners of the modern Revolution even more than Wyclif and Hus, Luther and Calvin. The Fraticelli and their supporters were the first in the Western Church to deny the infallibility of the Pope. The Defensor Pacis maintains the unconditional sovereignty of the people and the absolute democracy of the Church. According to this theory the General Council, composed of the members of the clergy and of laymen chosen by the people and summoned and directed by the State, stand at the head of the universal Church. The authority of the Pope is derived not from Christ, but from the Council and from the State. By divine right, all the members of the clergy have equal powers. The Council has legislative, the Pope only executive power. The Emperor, as the representative of the people, has the right of appointing, deposing and punishing priests, bishops and Popes. The supreme disposition of all ecclesiastical property belongs exclusively to the State. Unfortunately some imprudent defenders of the Church, too, exaggerated the rights of the Pope beyond all reasonable bounds.

From Milan, where he received the Iron Crown from two deposed prelates, Ludwig marched to Rome. Meanwhile the Guelfic rule of Robert of Naples had been overthrown by the Ghibellines, who now admitted Ludwig into the city. Proclaimed Emperor in the name of the Roman people, Ludwig was crowned by Sciarra Colonna of infamous memory, and anointed by an apostate bishop. To counteract the excommunication and crusade published by John XXII., the Fraticello Pietro of Corvaria was nominated by Ludwig, chosen antipope by a Ghibelline crowd, and crowned with a red hat by the German king-elect. The clergy and the majority of the people stood aloof. Many prominent Ghibellines condemned the utterly lawless proceedings of the schismatical party. The success of Ludwig was of short duration. Dismally failing in his attempt to reduce Robert of Naples, he saw his supporters drop away one by one. A few months after his coronation he had to leave Rome, pelted with stones and pursued by the derisive jeers of the Romans, who at once declared for John XXII., and burnt the decrees of Ludwig and his pope on the Capitol. Many Ghibelline towns and nobles made their peace with the Church. Ludwig's extortions in Tuscany did the

rest. In 1329 he abandoned Italy. The following year the antipope made voluntary submission to John XXII. at Avignon. The death of Frederic of Austria, 1330, brought no peace to Germany, since Ludwig refused to comply with the demand of Pope John to lay down the imperial title.

15. Death of John XXII. — The indefatigable John XXII., whose letter-volumes contain more than 60,000 letters, died in 1334. In all his steps he rigidly adhered to the rights of the Papacy and the principles laid down by Innocent III. in a similar crown dispute (Vol. I., No. 531). But in Germany his measures carried less of conviction and authority, because John XXII. at *Avignon* did not enjoy the reputation for independence and impartiality which had been the strength of Innocent III. at *Rome*. During the Pontificate of Benedict XII., who was otherwise a reformer in the best sense of the word, Philip of France and Robert of Naples prevented any understanding between the Holy See and the German nation. The public confusion increased and the Papacy, caught in the toils of French policy, took no measures to succor the Church in Germany, which still groaned under the interdict of John XXII.

16. Ludwig's Radicalism. — In a meeting at Rhense, 1338, the German electors declared that according to ancient custom a candidate chosen by all the electors, or by *a majority*, stood in no need of papal confirmation to administer the property and the rights of the kingdom and to bear the title of Roman king. This decree became a law of the land and bound the minority in future elections to submit to the choice of the majority. Two weeks later Ludwig published a far more radical decree in the diet of Frankfort, which declared that the imperial power is derived immediately from God and inseparably connected with the royal dignity; that the Emperor cannot be judged by the Pope, but the Pope by a General Council; and that the German clergy is bound to disregard the papal interdict as invalid. This decree renewed in Germany the absolutism asserted by Frederic Barbarossa on the Roncalian Field (Vol. I., No. 474), and the Gallicanism of Philip the Fair. The consequence of the decree was, that on the one hand numerous clergymen, whose conscience forbade them to violate the interdict, had to flee or were expelled from the country, whilst, on the other hand, bishops, monasteries and priests openly disregarded the interdict as maintained by Popes, who acted under a sort of French servitude. This deplorable state was one of the fruits of the "Exile."

17. The Fall of Ludwig. — The contest entered into a new phase, when Ludwig, to increase the prestige of his House, dissolved "by the plenitude of imperial power" the marriage of Margaret of Carinthia and Tyrol with prince John of Bohemia, and, disregarding the impediment of consanguinity, married the heiress to his son Ludwig of Brandenburg. Europe stood aghast at this invasion of the spiritual rights of the Church. The marriage exasperated the House of Luxemburg and the majority of the German nobles. Five of the seven electors with the consent of Pope Clement VI. declared the throne vacant, deposed Ludwig because he had brought the realm to the brink of destruction, and elected Charles IV., the son of king John of Bohemia, 1346, who, after the death of Ludwig in 1347, was universally recognized as king of the Romans.

Externally the victory of the Papacy was decided. Charles IV. satisfied every demand of the court of Avignon. The people gradually returned to their wonted obedience. But the authority of the Papacy was nevertheless injured by the bitterness with which John XXII. and Clement VI. had carried on the contest. The latter, especially, went to extremes.

18. The Residence at Avignon and its Effects. — The residence of the Popes under French tutelage was maintained by the regular creation of a majority of French Cardinals. Benedict XII. began the building of the famous Palace of the Popes, a combination of palace, castle, cloister and prison. Clement VI. extended the papal possessions in France by the purchase of Avignon from the queen of Naples. The county of Venaissin already belonged to the Holy See, having been donated to the Popes in the treaty of 1227 which ended the Albigensian wars. Through these territories the heads of the Church became as counts of Venaissin and Avignon, vassals of the French crown. The excessive exercise of the undoubted papal right to levy taxes on church property by some of these Popes (John XXII., Clement VI., Gregory XI.), encountered resistance in England, Germany and other countries. The pontificate of Clement VI. was a period of prodigality and luxury in the papal city and court. His austere and saintly successors, Innocent VI. and Blessed Urban V., did their utmost to put a stop to this extravagance. But the efforts of even the best Popes were unable to stem the tide of general luxury which the prosperity of the leading countries of Europe had produced. The clergy of all degrees, with honorable exceptions, went with the current. A reformation of the clergy and of the laity was imperatively demanded. But Avignon was not the place to start it. The suspicions of foreign nations on account of the dependent position of the French vassal Popes, the rising spirit of nationality in opposition to the previous unity of Christendom, the frightful confusion of Roman and Italian

affairs, the angry opposition to the ordinary and extraordinary taxes levied by the Avignonese Popes, and the decrease of love, veneration and obedience towards the Holy See among the people, were the price which they had to pay for their quiet sojourn and magnificent home at Avignon.

Pastor-Antrobus: *History of the Popes from the Close of the Middle Ages*, v. 1. — *The Popes of Avignon*, pp. 57–116. — R. Parsons: *The Pontificate of John XXII.*: Studies, v. 2 p. 497. — Card. Hergenroether: *Johannes XXII. Sein Kampf mit Ludwig dem Bayern: Kirchen Geschichte*, vol. 2, pp. 13–26; *Catholic Church and Christian State; Louis of Bavaria, etc.*, vol. 2, pp. 52–60. — Döllinger: *The Struggle, etc., under Ludwig of Bavaria:* Studies, p. 119. — Henderson: *The Law Licet juris of the Frankfort Diet of 1338: Sel. Hist. Docs.* — Gregorovius: *History of Rome*, Book IX., 1305–1345. — Hefele on *Ludwig of Bavaria and the Popes: Concilien Geschichte*, vol. 6, pp. 575–663. — L. de Laincel: *Avignon.* — L'Abbé V. Verlaque: *Jean XXII.sa vie et ses oeuvres.* — André: *Hist. Politique.* — Christophe: *Histoire.* — De Beaumefort: *Cession de la ville, etc., d'Avignon au Pape Clement VI.* — B. Jungmann: *Series Pontificum Aveniomensium: Dissertationes selectae:* Dissert. 32, pp. 153–173; *De Minoritarum turbis*, pp. 174–188; *De dissidio inter Pontifices Aven. et Ludovicum Bavarum*, pp. 188–217. — Hoefler: *Die avignonesischen Paepste.* — E. Marcour: *Antheil der Minoriten am Kampfe, etc.* — Silbernagl: *Occam's Ansicht über Kirche und Staat.* — S. Riezler: *Die literarischen Widersacher der Paepste zur Zeit Ludwigs des Bayern.* — Damberger: *Synchron. Geschichte*, vols. 13 and 14.

§ 4.

CHARLES IV. RETURN OF THE PAPACY TO ROME.

19. Charles IV., 1347–1378. — The first years of the reign of Charles IV. were marked by famine, earthquakes, and a terrible pestilence, called the Black Death, which, arriving 1347 in Constantinople from Asia, spread over all Europe, and carried away more than one-third of its population. The number of deaths is roughly estimated at 25,000,000, in an age in which the population of England and Wales hardly outnumbered that of the London of to-day. The authority of both the Pope and the Emperor was needed to overcome two social evils rising from the dire visitation: the fanatical processions of the flagellants, bands of men and women who went from place to place scourging themselves in public; and the slaughter of Jews, the financial oppressors of the Christians, whom popular excitement charged with poisoning wells. After this time of general suffering the peaceful reign of Charles IV., who ruled over thirty years, was productive of numerous beneficial institutions, chiefly for Bohemia, but also for Germany. The University of Prague, the first in the German Empire, was a monument to the zeal of this cultured king.

In 1355 Charles IV. was crowned Emperor by two Cardinal deputies of the Pope. Upon his return to Germany the Emperor pub-

lished in the Diets of Nürnberg and Metz (1355–56) the Golden Bull which defined by written law the rights of the electors hitherto founded on custom. The right of electing the king was confined to the seven princes who had officiated at the election of Rudolph of Hapsburg: the Archbishops of Mainz, Koeln and Trier; the king of Bohemia, cup-bearer; the duke of Saxony, marshal; the margrave of Brandenburg, chamberlain; and the palsgrave on the Rhine, seneschal of the Emperor. The three spiritual electors were chancellors respectively of Germany, Italy and Burgundy. The electors exercised full jurisdiction and regal rights in their territories. The Golden Bull gave to the German constitution a distinctly federal character. A second expedition of the Emperor to Italy, 1368, in alliance with the Pope against the powerful Visconti of Milan, led to no practical result.

20. **Cola di Rienzi in Rome** — In Rome Cola di Rienzi, a fiery demagogue of humble parentage, rose to power. He proclaimed in 1347 a new constitution for the city of Rome, which placed all public power nominally into the hands of the people, in reality, into his own. Together with a papal governor he was chosen Tribune of the People, and acknowledged by Clement VI. Cola abolished the privileges of the barons and styled himself the Liberator of the Holy Roman Republic. For a time his brilliant administration produced a very marked improvement in the affairs of the city. Having gained a complete ascendency in Rome, his next aim was to unite the cities of Italy, and to assemble around him a senate of Italian deputies. Many cities accepted the invitation. In a vast assembly of the people, the tribune declared the jurisdiction of the city and people of Rome to extend over the whole world, proclaimed the liberty of every Italian city, made all Italians Roman citizens, vindicated to the Roman Republic the right of electing the Emperor, and summoned all prelates, emperors, electors, kings, dukes, etc., who should dare to question these claims to appear before his tribunal. A luxurious life and a spirit of haughtiness bordering on insanity, soon alienated the people from Cola. A legate of Clement VI. aided by the Roman nobles overthrew his government. The pious Innocent VI. sent Cardinal Albornoz to Italy to restore the papal government in the States of the Church. In a series of hard fought battles he defeated the petty princes and lords who usurped all power in the patrimony of St. Peter and confirmed his conquests by a policy of justice and conciliation (1354–67). Complying with the wish of Innocent VI. he appointed Cola di Rienzi Senator of Rome, 1354. A second time Cola destroyed his own career by his reckless luxury aggravated by oppression and cruelty. Cola was murdered in a rising of the people.

21. **The Last Popes of Avignon — Urban V., 1362-70.** — The saintly Urban V. made preparations on a large scale for a new Crusade. John the Good, king of France, was appointed commander-in-chief. His death prevented the contemplated expedition. A fleet which sailed under the king of Cyprus, took Alexandria, but, unsupported from the West, had to abandon the undertaking. The appeal of the Emperor and the cry of Italy — saints, poets and people imploring the Pope to return — prevailed on Urban V. to visit Rome 1367. But the confusion of affairs in Italy, the constant urging of the French Cardinals, and his own desire for the more quiet sojourn on the Rhone drew him back to Avignon, where he died shortly after his arrival, as St. Bridget had prophetically warned him.

22. Gregory XI. returns to Rome, 1377. — Affairs in Italy grew worse under his successor Gregory XI., the last French Pope. The employment of Provençals in the government of the States of the Church led to a national rising such as Italy had never seen before. It was the first outbreak of the antagonism between the Italians and the French, which characterized the wars of the 16th century. The Republic of Florence, once the strongest ally of the Pope, allied with Barnabo Visconti, the inveterate enemy of the Holy See, stood at the head of the movement. Nearly all the provinces and cities of northern and central Italy joined in the revolt of the Papal States. In a few months the conquests of Albornoz were lost. Gregory declared war, sent the fierce Cardinal Legate Robert of Geneva with Breton troops to Italy and issued a terrible interdict against Florence, which crippled her commerce. St. Catherine of Sienna, one of the most wonderful characters in the history of the world, in whom the religious fervor of Italy found its highest and purest expression, wrote letters of peace in every direction. The Florentines sent her as their ambassadress to Avignon. Thwarted in her work of reconciliation by the duplicity of the Florentine magistrates who withdrew their terms of peace whilst negotiations were pending, she continued to exhort Gregory to return to Rome, to restore peace, and then to turn his attention to a general reformation of the clergy. Gregory XI. followed her advice, arrived in Italy, 1376, and was joyfully welcomed in Rome, 1377. He found the ancient monuments destroyed, most of the 414 basilicas in ruins, commerce paralyzed, and the number of inhabitants reduced to 30,000. Yet notwithstanding the wild display of joy at his return, civil dissensions continued, cities remained in revolt, Florence and her allies continued

the war. And just when peace seemed on the point of being effected, Gregory died, 1378, before he could carry out his intention of returning to Avignon.

Babylonian Exile: Party Spirit in Italy: M., vol. 8, p. 261. — Hergenroether: *Karl. VI, und die letzten Paepste v. Avignon:* K. G. v. 2, pp. 26–34. — On *Exile in Avignon:* Hefele: C. G., v. 6, pp. 393–726. — Werunsky: *Gesch. Kaiser Karls IV.; Ital. Politik Papst Innozenz VI. und K. Karls IV.* — Huber: *Regesten Karls IV.* — Gottlob: *Karls IV., private und politische Beziehungen zu Frankreich.* — R. Parsons: *Rienzi* — On *Rienzi.* also: J. Schmitz (*Sammlung histor. Bildnisse*), F. Papencordt (*Cola di Rienzi und seine Zeit*); Reumont: *Rom (Rienzi and Albornoz,* v. 2, pp. 845–1004); H. P. B., vol. 20, pp. 469, 587, 654. — Magnan: *Hist. d'Urban V. et de son siècle.* — T. G. Trollope: *Hist. of Florence.* — H. Leo: *Gesch. v. Italien.* — Dr. H. J. Wurm: *Cardinal Albornoz, der zweite Begründer des Kirchenstaates:* I. K. Z. '95, p. 729. — *Urban V. and his Legate,* M., vol. 2, p. 557 (Old Series). — Augusta T. Drane: *The History of St. Catharine of Siena and her Companions — The Public Life of St. Catharine of Siena:* M. v. 2, p. 398 (O. S.). — *St. Catharine at Florence:* M., vol. 3, p. 54 (O. S.). — *St. Catharine of Siena:* D. R. '80, 3, p. 128. — *St. Catharine of Siena:* C. T. S. P., vol. 14. — A. Capecelatro — J. Conrad: *Gesch. d. hl. Katharina v. S. und des Papsthums ihrer Zeit.* — (Other books on Popes of Avignon see under § 2 and 3 esp. Pastor-Antrobus; B. Jungmann; Creighton; Christophe; André. On the Black Death, see ch. 2, § 64.)

§ 5.

THE GREAT WESTERN SCHISM.

23. Election of Urban VI., 1378. — The sixteen Cardinals who were present in Rome, and of whom eleven were Frenchmen, entered the Conclave which followed the death of Gregory XI. (April 7). The Romans fearing lest a French Pope might return to Avignon, clamored for a Roman, or, at least, an Italian Pope. To avoid the charge of intimidation the Cardinals by more than a two-thirds majority elected an Italian, but not a Roman, in the person of the Archbishop of Bari (April 8). When tranquillity was restored the Cardinals confirmed the election by a new scrutiny (April 9). The Pope-elect assumed the name of Urban VI. All the Cardinals, including the six who had remained in Avignon, acknowledged for the next three months the validity and the freedom of the election by their acts and their signatures.

24. Election of Robert of Geneva. — It was a great misfortune for the Church that Urban's purity of life, zeal for reform and great learning were accompanied by a passionate impetuosity of temper. The harsh manner with which he addressed himself to the task of reforming Cardinals and bishops gradually estranged the

worldly-minded prelates. His unqualified refusal to return to Avignon drove the French Cardinals into open rebellion. They first withdrew to Anagni, whence they proclaimed the *vacancy* of the Roman See (Aug. 9). A quarrel of Urban VI. with queen Jane of Naples opened that kingdom to them, and they repaired to Fundi. Deserted by his old Cardinals, Urban VI. created on September 18th twenty-nine new ones. Two days afterwards the twelve French Cardinals and the Spaniard Peter de Luna consummated the schism. Assured of the armed assistance of Charles V. of France, they chose in the person of Cardinal Robert of Geneva, the antipope, Clement VII. They could not have chosen a better leader of revolt. He had given ample proof of his relentless energy in the late war by the ruthless massacre of the inhabitants of Cesena (1377). Robert of Geneva gathered around him the Breton free-lances whom Gregory XI. had sent to Italy, but was defeated by the "Company of St. George," under Alberigo de Barbiano. Thereupon Clement VII. fled to Avignon.

25. Spread of the Schism. — The schism was the result of the disastrous Avignon period. The worldly-minded Cardinals stirred up by France longed to return thither. Therefore France became the chief support of the schism. It was the government of France which gradually obtained for Clement VII. the obedience of the Paris University, of Aragon and Castile, of Scotland, Savoy and Cyprus. On the other hand, England, Brittany, Portugal, the greater part of Italy, Germany, Hungary, Poland, Flanders, Sweden, Norway, and the Catholic Orient adhered to the obedience of Urban VI. In Naples Queen Jane, of the French line of the House of Anjou, who supported Clement, was overthrown, and Charles III. of Durazzo, representing the Italian Anjous, was crowned by Urban.

This Pope persisted in his unfortunate policy of turning all his friends into enemies. He became involved in a bitter strife with Charles III. of Naples, the king of his own making. He imprisoned, tortured and executed six Cardinals, who had devised means, it is said, to place him under the guardianship of a body of Cardinals, and by this excessive severity drove others into the camp of Clement VII. Urban died in 1389 after a stormy Pontificate of eleven years. Fourteen Cardinals who had always adhered to him, elected his successor, Boniface IX. At his death in 1404 the legitimate Roman line was continued by Innocent VII., 1404–1406.

26. Effects of the Schism. — Before the Great Western Schism twenty-seven antipopes had been raised by different parties. But those schisms had lasted only a short time, or exhibited the character of lawlessness and violence so clearly, that no well-intentioned person could be in doubt as to who was the true successor of St. Peter. But now the schism issued from the very body that had the right to elect the Pope, from the Cardinals themselves. The Church was torn not into different *sects* but into different *obediences*. For whilst all Catholics agreed that only *one* could be the lawful successor of St. Peter, the nations divided on the purely historical question, which of the two or three competitors was lawfully elected. People at a distance were at a loss to decide, since so many Cardinals who had elected Urban VI., went over to Clement VII. Persons of the highest sanctity took stand on either side. St. Catherine of Siena and St. Catherine of Sweden, the latter an eye-witness of what occurred in Rome during the election, were staunch supporters of Urban whilst the Spaniard, St. Vincent of Ferrer, and the Blessed Peter of Luxemburg, acknowledged the French Pope with equal fervor. Nevertheless the schism created a frightful confusion in Christendom. In France especially, the Church had to pay dearly for her Gallicanism. The antipope and his thirty-six cardinals reserved to themselves most of the higher dignities and revenues of the French cathedrals and monasteries. While waging the Hundred Years' War, France groaned under the burden of maintaining single-handed a royal court and a papal court. In many dioceses of other countries two bishops claimed the same bishopric, two abbots the same abbey under their respective obedience. In many churches divine service was neglected. The religious devotion of the people grew lukewarm. The prestige of the Holy See fell in the eyes of the nations. The schism made the Popes more dependent on the support of the princes than any previous event. It gave the first impulse to the royal "Placet," i. e. the subjection of papal letters to the approval of secular governments. Finally the schism and the heretical movement which accompanied it contributed more than anything else to the great apostacy of the sixteenth century.

27. Heretical Movements — John Wyclif. — Coincident with the Avignon period and the Western Schism there arose in England and Bohemia a most dangerous heretical movement. The doctrines of Occam were revived and still more perverted by the teachings of John Wyclif, a scholar of Oxford, later vicar of Lutherworth (d. 1383). In his earlier career he had lost a suit against the Archbishop of Canterbury before the papal court for want of proofs. This disappointment, and his failure to obtain the bishopric of Winchester, turned him into a bitter enemy of Pope, bishops, and friars, a heretic who devised a new creed, a new code of morality, and a new system of politics. He began with opposing papal taxation and the payment of the tribute of king John to the Holy See. He next adopted the anarchical error, that mortal sin being a breach of allegiance to God, destroys the basis of all power and deprives the sinner of all right of ownership in ecclesiastical or

secular property. He finally denied Transubstantiation, the Primacy of St. Peter, oral tradition and other dogmas. No serious measures were taken against Wyclif, since various members of the royal family stood between him and the punishment which otherwise would have been inflicted on him. His doctrines were spread through England by his "poor priests" or "canters" and gave rise to the sect of the Lollards.

28. John Hus. — Jerome of Prague, an Oxford scholar, brought the books of Wyclif to Bohemia, where they captivated John Hus, a priest and university man of Prague. With astonishing simplicity Hus copied the writings of Wyclif and gave them out as his own. He showed in the beginning great zeal for the reformation of the clergy. But with Wyclif for his guide he fell into errors fatal not only to the Catholic faith, but to all human government, to the existence of human society itself. According to both, the Church is the congregation of the predestinate. The Pope is the antichrist. The hierarchy is an institution of the Emperor or of the devil. The Bible is the only source of faith. No temporal or spiritual ruler in the state of mortal sin has any legitimate power, and it is a right of the subjects to declare whether their superiors are in a state of sin. Habitual sinners are incapable of ownership in any kind of property by whatsoever title they may hold it. Temporal lords may at their pleasure (according to Hus, must under penalty of eternal damnation) deprive delinquent prelates of their temporal goods. The people may, at will, punish delinquent lords. It is evident that such maxims led to wholesale robbery and anarchy in Church and State. The insurrections of Wat Tyler and Oldcastle in England, and the bloody Hussite wars in Bohemia were but attempts to reduce these doctrines to social facts.

Pastor-Antrobus: *The Schism and the Great Heretical Movement, 1378–1406*, v. 1, pp. 117–174. — R. Parsons: *The Great Western Schism:* Studies, vol. 2, p. 522; *Wycliffe*, p. 568, *John Hus*, vol. 3, p. 1. — X. S. F. Smith, S. J.: *The Great Schism of the West: Historical Papers;* M. '93, 2, pp. 77 and 194. — Creighton: *Urban VI., Clement VII. and the Affairs of Naples;* v. 1, pp. 55–93; *Religious Movements in Oxford and Paris; Clement VII. and Boniface IX.*, pp. 94–127.—Noël Valois: *La France et le Grand Schisme d'Occident.* — Du-Chesne: *Histoire de tous les cardinaux Français de naissance.* — Dr. Orest. Brownson: *Avignon and the Schism* (N. Y. Series, vol. 2). — Joseph Stevenson, S. J.: *The Truth about John Wyclif; John Wyclif;* M. 82, 1, p. 43; *The English Lollards:* M. '82, 1, pp. 213 and 484; *John Wyclif, his Life and Teaching:* M. '84, 2, p. 457; 3, pp. 153, 305, 522. — L. Delplace, S. J.: *Wycliffe and his Teaching concerning the Primacy:* D. R. '84, 1, p. 23.— *The Lollards:* D. R. '96, 1, p. 40. — Mary H. Allies: *True Catholic Reformers of the 15th Century; Vincent Ferrer; Bernardin of Siena.* — B. Wilberforce, O. P.: *St. Vincent Ferrer*, C. T. S. P. 12. — B. Jungmann: *De electione Urbani VI. et ortu Schismatis*, v. 6, Dissert. 33, pp. 238-263. — Walsingham, O. S. B. *Historia Anglicana* (Time of Wyclif). — Hergenroether: *Das grosse paepstliche Schisma*, K. G., v. II., pp. 34–42. — Hefele: *Gesch. des Schismas*, C. G. v. 6, pp. 727–826; *Uber die Entstehung der grossen allg. Kirchenspaltung: Beiträge zur K. G.*, v. 1, 326. — Reumont: *Das grosse Schisma: Rom.*, v. 2, p. 1005.— R. Bauer, S. J.: *Das grosse abendländische Schisma:* St. v. 1, p. 332. — G. Lechler: *J. v. Wyclif und die Vorgeschichte der Reformation.* — On the *Hussite Movement in Bohemia*, H. P. B., v. 45, pp. 885, 969, 1053; vol. 46, pp. 1,97.

§ 6.

ATTEMPTS OF A RE-UNION.

29. House of Bohemia-Luxemburg.

HENRY VII. OF LUXEMBURG, 1308–1313.

John, King of Bohemia (by marriage with the heiress Elizabeth).

CHARLES IV., 1347–1378.

Henry of Moravia.

Jobst of Moravia, 1410–1411 (rival to Wenzel after Ruprecht's death).

Wenzel (sole king of Romans, 1378–1400, opposed by *Ruprecht,* 1400–1410, reduced to Bohemia, 1410–1419).

SIGISMUND, 1410-1437, king of Hungary by marriage; king of Bohemia since 1419.

30. Germany Under King Wenzel, 1378–1400. — The death of Charles IV., 1378, placed his eldest son Wenzel on the throne of Germany, whilst the younger son Sigismund, duke of Brandenburg, became king of Hungary by his marriage with Mary, the daughter and heiress of Louis the Great. Wenzel, a savage and profligate drunkard, made himself many enemies among the barons of Bohemia, his native kingdom, and set the clergy against himself by his cruelties. Among other misdeeds he ordered St. John Nepomucene to be drowned in the Moldavia, because the Saint refused to reveal the confessions of the pious queen. There was little justice meted out by Wenzel; the powerful could oppress the weak with impunity. As Germany was entirely neglected by Wenzel the different estates took the defense of their rights or claims into their own hands. In the north a measure of order and security was maintained by the Hansa, which about this time reached its highest power and extent. Originally a guild of German merchants living abroad, the name was transferred to a league of northern cities which undertook the protection of their commercial interests in the absence of a strong central government. In its palmiest days the Hansa numbered about 85 cities, chief among them Lübek.

Bremen, Hamburg, Köln, Brunswick and Danzig. Its highways were the Baltic and the North Sea. Most of the commerce of the Scandinavian kingdoms was carried by vessels under the Hansa flag. It had factories in Denmark, Sweden, Russia and England. Its furthest outposts east and west were Novgorod and London. In the south the powerful Suabian league united since 1344 the cities of Suabia, Bavaria and the Rhineland for the purpose of defending their privileges, their free city governments, their artisan and trade guilds, their commerce and great wealth against all comers. This civic alliance called forth a league of the princes, who became afraid of the great organization of partly aristocratic partly democratic municipalities, the more so, as they just then witnessed the successful struggle of the Swiss citizens against the powerful dukes of Austria and their mail-clad nobles. Between the princes and the cities, the knights or lower nobility, sometimes assisted the princes against the cities, more often broke forth from their castles and carried on a lawless warfare of private robbery against burgher and peasant. The first city war broke out under Wenzel. Eberhard of Würtemberg led the leagues of princes and knights and inflicted a heavy defeat on the city forces at Doeffingen, 1388. But the temporary discomfiture neither checked the steady progress of the cities, nor prevented the formation of new leagues.

31. The Vehme. — The absence of the king and the inefficiency of the regular courts to suppress violence, developed another means of self-help, the Vehme (from vervehmen: to ban, to curse), also called Free-court or Vehmic court. It was a remnant, it seems, of the old Saxon county or schoeffen court under Charles the Great, which had been preserved among the freemen of Westphalia, to decide criminal cases by a jury of their peers. The president of the Free-court, attended by 14–28 assessors, received power of life and death from the Emperor in person, or his representative, the elector of Koeln. The meetings of this court, which in earlier times were public, became secret in the fourteenth century. Its judgments were carried out with startling suddenness. The thieves, robbers and disturbers of the public peace, once convicted in secret session, were struck down when they least expected it. The authority of the Vehmic court was recognized throughout Germany, and spread a salutary terror. In the days of its comparative usefulness it knew no respect of persons, and many evil-doers in high places who defied the ordinary tribunals were made to feel its power. But the secrecy and mysteriousness which shrouded its transactions

opened the door to the gravest abuses, caused the opposition of princes and others, and doomed it to destruction. The re-establishment of a regular administration of justice proved its death blow in the fifteenth century.

32. The Election of Palsgrave Ruprecht, 1400. — In 1400 the four Rhenish electors met and charged Wenzel with having failed to promote the union of the Church, to establish peace and order in Germany, and with bartering away the rights of the Empire by selling the title of hereditary duke of Milan to Galeazzo Visconti. Declaring that Wenzel had forfeited the crown, the three spiritual electors chose Ruprecht palsgrave on the Rhine to succeed him. Ruprecht was a strong, honest and high-minded character, but too poor to extend his power over the whole Empire, or to enforce his authority in Lombardy, whilst Wenzel was too indolent to interfere seriously with Ruprecht's rule in Germany. Boniface IX. recognized Ruprecht as king of the Romans.

33. Plans of the University of Paris. — Whilst the successors of Urban VI. were governing the Church at Rome, a strong movement towards a reunion sprang up in France. A first attempt to unite the Catholic monarchs in common action, and thus force both competitors to abdicate, failed. Thereupon the University of Paris, in 1394, proposed three plans of union: (a) The way of cession, according to which both claimants should abdicate. This plan waived the question of right. (b) The way of compromise, by which a commission chosen by both parties should decide the point of right. These two ways contained no prejudice to the authority of the claimants, since their acceptance depended on the claimants themselves. As a matter of fact both claimants rejected the two proposals. (c) The third way, a General Council, to be called to depose both claimants, if they refused to abdicate or compromise, was based on the supposition, that a Council has a higher authority than the Pope. This Gallican assumption was ardently advocated by the universities of Paris and Bologna. The demand that as many university doctors should have seat and vote in this council as bishops, was little short of a revolutionary innovation. Clement VII. in the state of chagrin and depression which this union movement caused him, died of a stroke of apoplexy, 1394. By the hasty election of the artful Cardinal Peter de Luna as Benedict XIII., the Cardinals of Avignon destroyed the opportunity which the death of the antipope offered for a union of Christendom. Peter de Luna rejected the plans of the University, and France for some years withdrew her obedience from him without recognizing the lawful Pontiff in Rome. This "subtraction" of obedience from a Pope whom France acknowledged as lawfully chosen, was a further step in her revolutionary course, and implied an attack upon the Papacy itself.

34. **Election of Gregory XII. and its Results.** — In the Conclave of 1406 every Cardinal obliged himself under oath to resign, if elected, as soon as the antipope would resign or die, provided that the Cardinals of Avignon would join the Roman Cardinals in electing a new Pope. The new Pope was to inform Peter de Luna of this capitulation and to agree with him about a place for a personal meeting; within the next fifteen months the new Pope should create no more Cardinals than necessary to keep his own College in equal numerical strength with that of his rival. It must be borne in mind, however, that neither the College of Cardinals nor the Cardinal to be elected could bind the future Pope, or diminish his powers. The Pope, who receives his power immediately from God, is responsible for such an oath to God and his conscience, but not to the Cardinals or any other human tribunal. Later such "capitulations" before a papal election were prohibited by the Church.

Gregory XII. owed his election to his irreproachable rectitude of life, his sterling honesty and his reputation as a zealous advocate of union. His first steps were strictly in accordance with his oath which he renewed after his election. He agreed with Peter de Luna about Savona as the place of a personal meeting. But it soon became apparent that he had no intention to go to Savona where his rival appeared with an army and a fleet. Some ascribe this change of front to a newly awakened love of power, others to the influence of his nephews. Neither explanation is sufficient. Gregory XII. received reliable information about the existence of a French plot to *force* both claimants to abdicate — and Savona then belonged to France. As no agreement could be reached concerning the choice of a new place, Gregory finally broke off all negotiations, and the fifteen months having elapsed began to create new Cardinals. Thereupon seven of his Cardinals charged him with the violation of his oath and separated from him. Meanwhile France had abandoned Benedict XIII. and refusing obedience to either claimant declared her neutrality. Benedict accompanied by four of his Cardinals fled to Spain, whilst six others joined the seven Cardinals who had withdrawn from Gregory, 1408.

As if the Holy See had really been vacant, this self-constituted body of Cardinals began to assume the position of the actual rulers of the Church, summoned their respective adherents to a General Council to meet at Pisa in 1409, and solicited the co-operation of the Catholic princes. Union and reform were assigned as the objects of

its deliberations. They were assisted in their undertaking by the intense and widespread desire for a restoration of unity, and by the revolutionary theory of the superiority of the Council over the Pope, to which university men of the stamp of Occam, Marsiglio, etc., had given wide currency.

Pastor-Antrobus: *Attempts to heal the Schism;* vol. 1., pp. 164–174. — Creighton: *Attempts of France to heal the Schism; A Hist. of the Papacy, etc.;* vol. 1, pp. 129–161; *Troubles in Italy and France, 1404–1406,* pp. 162–174; *Gregory XII., and Benedict XIII. Negotiations between the Rivals;* pp. 175–199. — Card. Hergenroether: *Unionsversuche;* K. G., v. 2, pp. 42–60. — Hefele: *Unionsbestrebungen,* C. G. vol. 6, pp. 826–991. — *Pedro di Luna:* M.; vol. 3, p. 411; vol. 5, p. 160 (Old Series). — B. Jungmann: *De schismatis incrementis,* vol. 6. — Dissert. 33, p. 263. — *Histories of Germany.* — J. Weizsäcker: *Deutsche Reichstagsacte unter Koenig Wenzel.* — C. Hoefler: *Ruprecht von der Pfalz: Kaiserthum und Papstthum.* — *Ruprecht von der Pfalz:* H. P. B., vol. 49, p. 738. — *On Wenzel's deposition:* H. P. B., vol. 90, pp. 90, 185, 249. — *Wenzel und der hl. Joh. Nepomuck:* *Katholik,* '79, 1, p. 393; *Bauer in St.,* vol. 18, p. 129; H. P. B., vol. 83, p. 558; I. K. Z. '83, p. 52. — A. Friind: *Der geschichtliche St. J. Nepomuck.*

§ 7.

THE COUNCIL OF PISA, 1409.

35. Action of the Council of Pisa. — The Council of Pisa numbered 24 Cardinals, 4 Patriarchs, 182 bishops or episcopal deputies, 833 monastic prelates or their deputies, over 100 deputies of cathedral chapters and 300 doctors of theology and canon law representing 13 universities; besides embassadors of nearly all European courts. The members were swayed by the new theories of university men, especially of the doctors of Paris and Bologna. Both Gregory XII. and Benedict XIII. had declined the summons to Pisa. The Council, presided over by the senior Cardinal of Poitiers, first declared itself lawfully summoned, *ecumenical* and competent to re-establish order in the Church. Without an attempt to decide between the claims of the competitors or to settle the question of right, it boldly assumed authority over the two Popes, one of whom was certainly legitimate. In vain did the ambassadors of king Ruprecht urge, that it belonged to the Pope alone to summon a General Council, that if Gregory's election had been unlawful, the Cardinals' own position must be doubtful; that the union of the two colleges was illegal, as the Cardinals of but one party would be lawful; in vain did Carlo Malatesta, lord of Rimini, who represented Gregory XII., declare, that his master was willing to appear before

the Council and resign his dignity, even should Benedict refuse to do so, provided the Council would transfer its sessions to a place outside the jurisdiction of hostile Florence. The Council condescended to offer him the option of Pistoria. But as Pistoria was in the dominion of Florence, the offer was refused. The Council then proceeded to carry out its foregone conclusion. It was declared to be a matter of public notoriety that Gregory XII. and Benedict XIII. were not only schismatics because they had frustrated the accomplishment of a reunion, but actual heretics because they had overthrown the article of faith: I believe in *one* holy Catholic and apostolic Church. Accordingly the Council declared them deposed and elected Cardinal Peter Philargi, Archbishop of Milan, who assumed the name of Alexander V.

36 Character of the Council of Pisa. — The Council of Pisa was *not* a General Council. It was not ecumenical (a) in its *convocation*, because it was not summoned by the Roman Pontiff (whichsoever of the two be deemed legitimate), but by Cardinals in resistance to the Pontiff; (b) nor in its *celebration*, because the legitimate Pope and his obedience were not represented in the Council; (c) nor in its *conclusion*, because its acts and decrees were not confirmed by a certainly legitimate Pope, were repudiated by nearly one-half of the episcopate, and overturned by a later General Council (Constance).

As to the question whether the Council was not at least a legitimate ecclesiastical though not a general synod convened in a case of extreme necessity, in other words, whether after the Council of Pisa Gregory XII. or Alexander V. was the legitimate Pope, the earlier opinions differed. Later researches, however, have thrown more light on this intricate question, and the consensus of the best Catholic authorities of our time recognizes in Gregory XII. the lawful Pope before and after the Council of Pisa. For the case was not one of extreme necessity, nor were all the means of effecting a union exhausted. The acceptance of Carlo Malatesta's proposal might have prevented a new schism. The charge of heresy was so flimsy and far-fetched, that the Fathers themselves could hardly have taken it seriously. If Gregory XII. was the legitimate Pope up to the Council of Pisa, the Council could not depose him; if he was not legitimate, neither were the Cardinals legitimate who elected Alexander V.; his election was invalid. No right exists by which a lawful Pope can be deposed. If Gregory broke his word, he sinned, but he did not forfeit his Pontificate. If there was no right to depose the Pope, there was no right to elect a new one. Gregory XII. was therefore acting within the law, when he condemned the proceedings of the Council of Pisa.

37. Results of the Council of Pisa.— The Council of Pisa was as great a failure in the matter of reform as in the matter of union. Instead of two, the Church had now three claimants to the Holy See. Alexander V. was recognized by the majority of Christendom; Gregory retained the obedience of Ruprecht, of a few German princes, of Naples and of some other parts of Italy. Benedict XIII. still retained his hold on Spain, Portugal, Scotland and on a few counties of France. The new schism reacted on the war raging between Ladislas, king of Naples (line of Durazzo) and the claimant Louis II. (line of Provence). Louis was recognized by Alexander V. He conquered with the aid of the warlike Cardinal Cossa several cities of the States of the Church defended by Ladislas, and by taking Rome, in 1410, opened the capital of the Catholic world to Alexander V. Alexander V. died the same year and the conciliar party chose Cardinal Cossa, a politician, courtier and soldier, to succeed him. He assumed the name of John XXIII.

38. Election of Sigismund, 1410. — Sigismund and John XXIII.— On the day when John XXIII. was elected, died Ruprecht, the king of the Rhenish League and the faithful friend of Gregory XII. The electoral college was divided; one party chose Sigismund of Hungary, the other Jobst of Moravia, while Wenzel continued to claim the title of king of the Romans. Thus there were three claimants to the Roman throne as there were three claimants to the Roman See. The death of Jobst of Moravia led, however, to a general recognition of Sigismund. "On his accession to the dignity of king of the Romans he set himself to realize the duties of his new position; to seek the peace and well-being of Christendom, to labor for the unity of the Church. With many failings Sigismund nourished a lofty ideal which he conscientiously labored to carry out." Meanwhile, an important change took place in Italy. After Ladislas of Naples had by a great victory driven his rival back to France (1411), he deserted the cause of Gregory XII. for political reasons, acknowledged John XXIII., and was recognized by him as king of Naples *and* Sicily (1412). The often-betrayed Gregory found a new asylum with his noble friend Carlo Malatesta at Rimini. But the following year the perfidious Ladislas broke into the Papal States, expelled John from Rome

and by making preparations for driving him from Italy, compelled the fugitive Pope to seek the protection of Sigismund, king of the Romans. Sigismund understood how to turn to account this change of circumstances. Convinced as he was that only a General Council could unravel the tangle of the threefold schism, he prevailed on the reluctant Pope to accept Constance, a German city, as the place of meeting. The objects of the Council were to be the removal of the schism, the extirpation of the prevalent heresies of Wyclif and Hus, and the reformation of the Church in head and members.

Pastor-Antrobus: *The Synod of Pisa*, 1409; vol. 1, pp. 175–191. — Reuben Parsons: *The Council of Pisa;* v. 3, p. 18.— Creighton: *The Council of Pisa, 1409;* vol. 1, 200–224; *Alexander V., 1409–1410; ibid.*, pp. 225–233. — B. Jungmann: *De Concilio Pisano;* vol. 6, Dissert: p. 279. — Hefele: C. G., vol. 6, pp. 992–1042. — Hergenroether, K. G., vol. 2, pp. 60–70. — R. Bauer, S. J.: *Gregor XII. und das Pisaner Concil St.;* vol. 1, p. 479. — Fr. v. Raumer: *Die Kirchenversammlungen von Pisa, Kostnitz und Basel.* — Michael, S. J.: *Geschichte des deutschen Volkes seit dem 15. Jahrhundert.* (Religious, economical, social introduction to the period.)

§ 8.

THE COUNCIL OF CONSTANCE, 1414–1418.

39. Organization. — The Council of Constance was the most brilliant and numerous assembly that the world as yet had seen. It was crowded with representatives of every European nation. 100,000 strangers thronged the streets and surroundings of Constance. It represented the intelligence, the learning and much of the power of the age. John XXIII. opened the assembly in November, 1414. Sigismund arrived on Christmas-eve from his coronation in Aachen. Soon after his arrival he invested the Hohenzollern Frederic of Nürnberg with the electorship of Brandenburg, the cradle and the foundation of the future kingdom of Prussia.

The great majority of the members acknowledged the Council of Pisa and John XXIII. as legitimate. To counteract the influence of the Cardinals and bishops, the assembly, democratic in its complexion, granted the right of voting to doctors of divinity, episcopal chapters, parish priests, ambassadors of princes and other representative laymen. Likewise to counteract the influence of the more conservative Italians, it ordered the deliberations to be held and the decisive votes to be cast by nations. By this arrangement the English nation with only twenty members and three bishops on the ground had the same power in a general session as the Italians who had nearly one-half of all the votes present. These innovations were opposed to

all law and precedent. Gradually the opinion began to prevail that, in order to secure the unity of Christendom, all the three claimants would have to retire, voluntarily or by compulsion. This latter opinion was adopted by a very numerous, active, and aggressive party of university men, who succeeded in gaining the greatest influence in the deliberations of the assembly. Paris alone had sent 200 doctors.

40. Exaggerated Claims of the Council. — The circulation among the members of charges against John XXIII., many of which were exaggerated or positively unjust, induced him to offer his resignation to the Council, if Gregory and Benedict would do the same. But instead of waiting for further developments, John secretly fled from Constance. In the excitement which his flight produced at Constance, and in the fear it might call into question the very existence of the Council, the assembly precipitately passed the notorious decrees based on the new idea of the superiority of a General Council over the Pope. It was decreed that the Council had its authority immediately from God and could not be dissolved or prorogued by the Pope without its own consent, that the present Council continued in full force after the flight of the Pope; that everyone, even *the Pope*, must obey the Council in matters concerning the *faith*, the extirpation of this schism, and the *reformation of the Church in head and members*, and that it had authority to coerce and punish all the faithful even the head of the Church.

Although in the opinion of many voters the decrees had dogmatical value and applied to all future Councils, the wording restricts them to the present Council and the present schism. These decrees, passed by a headless assembly, a majority of unauthorized persons, against the protest of all the Cardinals, were never confirmed by a Pope and consequently never obtained legal force. Nevertheless they served as the basis and the dogmatical argument for the later school of Gallicanism and the denial of papal infallibility.

41. Deposition of John XXIII. — The firmness and prudence of king Sigismund prevented the dispersion of the assembly. John XXIII. was arrested in his flight and confined in the neighborhood of Constance. After a trial in which the number of the previous charges was reduced, he was formally and solemnly deposed, and submitted to the sentence by an unqualified resignation of his possible right, 1415. He was then detained a prisoner in Germany till 1418, when he was ransomed by the new Pope, Martin V.

42. The Resignation of Gregory XII. — Although the deposition of John XXIII. had undone the work of the Council of Pisa, the Constance assembly was still in a most difficult quandary because the obediences of Gregory XII. and Benedict XIII. were as yet unrepresented. Gregory XII., the one legitimate Pope, solved the difficulty by his magnanimous resolution to abdicate. For this purpose he convoked the Council by his own authority, and ordered his adherents to join it. His Cardinal Legate read the Bull of convocation to the assembled *bishops*, who solemnly acknowledged it. Before the Council of Constance thus lawfully constituted under Gregory's acknowledged authority, his plenipotentiary Carlo di Malatesta declared the free and unconditional abdication of Gregory XII. In gratitude for this resignation the Council conferred on him the Cardinal bishopric of Porto, the legation of Ancona, and rank second only to that of the Pope. He died, however, the same year, 1417. His last words were: "I have not understood the world, and the world has not understood me."

43. Election of Martin V., 1417. — The Apostolic See was now vacant de jure, it became vacant de facto when the obedience of Benedict XIII. joined the Council, and Benedict became a Pope without a Church. To bring about this result, Sigismund undertook a journey to Spain and France. He was successful in the work of union, but his further attempts to reconcile England and France in the Hundred Years' War turned out a failure, though he was received with becoming festivities in Paris and London. With the prelates of Benedict XIII. the Spanish kingdoms and Scotland joined the Council of Constance. The Council thus representing the whole Church deposed Peter de Luna, 1417. To bring about the election of a new Pope, the Council decreed that for this time thirty other prelates from the different nations should be associated with the Cardinals present at Constance. This Conclave elected Cardinal Otto Colonna, a prelate worthy in every regard of his high position. Martin V. was joyfully acknowledged by the universal Church. The Schism was ended. With Martin V. presiding, the Council of Constance became an Ecumenical Council.

In its first stage the assembly of Constance was little more than a secular, international congress. It was in this period that the famous Gallican

decrees were passed. It became a legitimate ecclesiastical synod when it was joined by the obediences of Gregory XII. and Benedict XIII. It obtained the character of a *General Council* with the election and presidency of Martin V., the lawful successor of Gregory XII.

44. Causa Fidei. — To promote the unity of faith, the Council first condemned the heresies of Wyclif, and then took up the case of John Hus. Hus came to the Council of his own free will, offering to undergo the extreme punishment of heresy, if convicted. The safe-conduct, which Sigismund furnished him, in reality a traveling passport, protected him against all unlawful violence, but not against the sentence of the judge. In this sense only the safe-conduct was understood by Sigismund, by the Council, by Hus himself and by his partisans. To accuse Sigismund of a breach of the safe-conduct is absurd. Sigismund at first resented the arrest of Hus before a hearing was granted him. But Hus brought the arrest on himself by his unlawful proceedings. The Council forbade him to say Mass and to preach until his case should be decided. In contempt of the court Hus celebrated Mass every day, preached his heresies and held meetings in his residence. Under these circumstances the court was bound to place him under a mild arrest. The monstrous charge of a conciliar decree, that no faith need be kept with heretics, is founded (a) on the willful falsification of an actual decree which says the very opposite of the charge; (b) on one of the numerous individual schemes, which never saw the light of day in the Council of Constance.

45. Condemnation of Hus and Jerome of Prague, 1415. — The pleadings of Hus before the Council were a string of equivocations and contradictions. Hus not only denied having taught the doctrines actually contained in his books, but asserted to the end that he had written and preached the very opposite doctrines. The Council went far out of its way in the direction of leniency to induce him to sign a very mild recantation; but he rejected every overture. He was willing to dispute with the Council on equal terms and from Holy Writ alone, but refused to be judged. It is evident that no tribunal could accept such a position. In May, 1415, he was declared obstinate, delivered to the secular arm, and burnt at the stake according to the laws of the time. He suffered death with great bravery. Jerome of Prague fled from Constance, was re-arrested, recanted his heresies, then recanted his recantation and was burnt. Creighton, in his latest work, says on the trial of Hus: "The judge is appointed to execute existing laws, and till those laws are repealed by the properly constituted authority, the best attempts to amend them by individual protest must be reckoned as rebellion. His opinions were judged by the Council to be subversive of the ecclesiastical system, and when he refused to submit to that decision, he was necessarily regarded as an obstinate heretic. The Council was anxious for his submission and gave him every opportunity to make it." By their absolute rejection of external authority, and the admission of the Bible alone as

the standard of faith, John Hus and Wyclif were forerunners of the Protestant rebellion. And since the external authority of the Church in matters of faith is final by divine right, this rising of the individual man against the order of things immutably established by God, is of all rebellions the most radical and subversive.

46. Causa Reformationis. — The third purpose for which the Council of Constance was originally summoned was the reformation of the Church in head and members. Through all the deliberations on reform, the nations could agree neither on the points proposed by the Reform Commission, nor the amendments proposed by the Pope. Thus the movement for a reform ended in a compromise. The Council as a whole accepted seven reform decrees. Concerning other points, chiefly methods of taxation, Martin V. concluded separate concordats, with the German and Latin nations for five years, with the English nation in the form of a permanent charter. The Council was formally dissolved in 1418.

Pastor-Antrobus: *Council of Constance*, vol. 1, pp. 192–207; *Martin V., 1417–1431, ibid.*, pp. 208–281. — R. Parsons: *The Council of Constance*, vol. III., p. 20. — Hefele: *Council of Constance*, vol. 7, part 1, pp. 1–365; part 2, pp. 1–374. — Hergenroether: K. G., vol. 2, pp. 70–90. — B. Jungmann: *De Concilio Constantiensi*, vol. 6, Dissert. 34, pp. 291–343. — Creighton: *John XXIII., 1410–1414*, vol. 1, pp. 234–260; *The Council of Constance and John XXIII, ibid.*, pp. 261–285; *Deposition of John XXIII., ibid.*, pp. 286–301; *Religious Movements in England and Bohemia, ibid.*, pp. 302–313; *John Hus in Bohemia, ibid.*, 314–331; *The Council of Constance and the Bohemian Reformers, ibid.* 333–361; *Sigismund's Journey and the Council during his Absence, ibid.*, pp. 362–377; *The Election of Martin V., ibid.*, 378–398; *Martin V. and the Reformation of Constance — End of the Council, ibid.*, pp. 399–419. — Bauer: *Das Concil von Constanz*, St., vol. 2, pp. 187, 338. — H. Finke: *Forschungen und Quellen zur Geschichte des Constanzer Concils;* also St., vol. 38, p. 240. — *Huss and sein Geleitsbrief*, H. P. B. vol. 4, p. 402. — B. Hübler: *Die Constanzer Reformation und die Concordate von 1418.* — Petrucelli della Gattina: *Histoire diplomatique des Conclaves.* — General History: *Gregorovius Hist. of Rome*, Book XII. (1355–1420). — J. Aschbach: *Geschichte Kaiser Sigismunds.* — M. Lenz: *Kaiser Sigismund und Heinrich V., von England.* — J. Schmitz: *Die französische Politik und die Unionsverhandlungen des C. v. Constanz.* — *The French in Italy* (to Barnabo and Gian Galeazzo Visconte), Q. R. '90, 1, p. 347.

§ 9.

THE HUSSITE WARS.

57. Outbreak of the Hussite Wars. — Upon the news of the execution of Hus arriving in Bohemia the Hussite nobles formed a league to maintain freedom of preaching. Insisting on the necessity of receiving Communion under both species (sub utraque specie),

they chose the chalice as their outward symbol; hence the party-names Utraquists and Calixtines. Only fourteen Catholic lords united for the defense of the Church, the Council of Constance and the faith of their fathers. The Hussites assembled on hill-tops, to which they gave biblical names (Horeb, Tabor). These meetings degenerated into bloody riots and attacks on the Catholics. The extreme party among the Hussites, the Taborites, rejected all reconciliation with both Rome and Sigismund. John Ziska with his peasantry, who were drilled into a fanatical army, destroyed churches and monasteries on all sides, ruthlessly devastated the lands of the Catholics, and repeatedly expelled Sigismund from Prague. A large army of the Rhenish electors was defeated in 1421. Sigismund himself was routed and driven from the country the following year. The army of Ziska, no longer occupied with repelling invasions, turned against the moderate Hussites, devastated Bohemia and carried fire and sword into Moravia and Hungary. The last year of his life, 1424, is called Ziska's bloody year for the merciless savagery with which he burnt and slaughtered to force his opinions on all. His death split the Hussites into three parties, the Calixtines, the most moderate, who were willing to treat for peace; the Orphans, who called Ziska their father and maintained his opinions, and the extreme Taborites. All three parties rejected Transubstantiation and the whole ecclesiastical system; their differences were political. The new leader, Procopius the Great, routed three crusades led by papal legates. Repeated invasions of Austria, Silesia, Bavaria, and Saxony and the devastation of the most flourishing provinces of Germany were intended to force a peace acceptable to Procopius on Church and State. The victories of the Taborites were ruinous to Bohemia herself, her commerce was annihilated, her lands were uncultivated.

48. Progress and Termination of the Hussite Wars. — It was under these circumstances that Martin V. summoned the Council of Basel (1431–48), but did not live to open it. Its deliberations fell into the Pontificate of Eugene IV. (1431–47). A lively but fruitless intercourse sprang up between Bohemia and Basel. Whilst the Hussites continued their atrocities at home and in Austria, the process of disintegration went steadily on, and resulted in the formation of six different sects. The annihilation

of a Taborite force in Bavaria caused a mutiny in the army of Procopius, which cost him his command, 1433. Once more the wrangling sects coalesced into two parties, the Moderates and the Irreconcilables. Bohemia again became a vast armed camp, and Procopius was recalled to lead the Irreconcilable Taborites. The Moderates submitted to Sigismund and joined the Catholic army. In the decisive battle of Lipan Procopius remained dead on the field, and the forces of the Irreconcilables were practically annihilated, 1434. The following year all the estates of Bohemia and Moravia in diet assembled professed their submission to the Catholic Church and the Holy See. The compact of Iglau, negotiated in the Council of Basel, granted them, as a matter of discipline, the use of the chalice, provided they firmly believed that Christ was received whole and entire under either species. Peace was proclaimed between Bohemia and the rest of Christendom, and Sigismund, who had been crowned Emperor in 1433, was acknowledged as king of Bohemia, and entered Prague in 1436.

49. Later Disturbances. — The death of Sigismund, king of Germany, Bohemia and Hungary, in 1437, revived the political and ecclesiastical agitation in Bohemia. The Catholics and moderate Calixtines chose Albrecht II., the son-in-law of Sigismund, and his successor in Germany. The Taborites elected Casimir, prince of Poland. After a reign of less than two years (1438–39) Albrecht was succeeded by his cousin Frederic III. (1439–1493, see no. 121), the last Emperor crowned in Rome (1452). Both the Bohemians and the Hungarians elected native kings, the former George Podiebrad who ruled the country in the interest of the Calixtines; the latter, Mathias Corvinus. Both successfully resisted the attempt of the weak Emperor to reduce them to submission. In Bohemia religious and civil peace was finally secured in 1485 by Ladislas, king of Poland and Bohemia. The Taborites henceforth formed a separate community, the Bohemian Brothers, numbering about 100,000 members.

Darras: *General Hist. of the Catholic Church;* Sixth Period, vol. 3, pp. 478-649. — Creighton: *Bohemia and the Hussite Wars, 1418-1431; Hist. of the Papacy, etc.*, vol. 2, pp. 37-60. — A. Frind: *Die Kirchengeschichte Boehmens.*— T. Palacky: *Gesch. von Böhmen.* F. von Bezold: *Koenig Sigismund und die Reichskriege gegen die Hussiten.* — B. Jungmann, vol. 6, p. 341.— On the Hussites, H. P. B., v. 26, p. 137, v. 39, p. 698.

§ 10.

THE CULMINATION AND COLLAPSE OF THE PSEUDO-CONCILIAR MOVEMENT.

50. The Council of Basel, 1431–1448. — The conciliar agitation as far as it was a revolutionary movement, reached its climax in the Council of Basel (1431–1448). It was strongly democratic in composition and tendency; only a small number of prelates was present to counterbalance the influence of the 500 or 600 members of the lower clergy. It began its work by inviting the Hussites to disputations, and quarreling with Eugene IV., the saintly successor of Martin V., about the transfer of its sessions to Bologna. It next encouraged Philippo Maria Visconti, the tyrant of Milan, to drive the Pope from Rome; it was the last flight of a Pope from Rome till the flight of Pius IX. in 1848. It swept away all the revenues of the Holy See, usurped right after right exclusively belonging to the head of the Church, and passionately resisted — though without success — the arrangements of Eugene for the meeting of a General Union Council in some city of Italy. The Byzantines, sorely threatened by the Ottoman Turks, were earnestly negotiating a union of the Greek with the Latin Church to enlist the West in the defense of the East. They demanded an Italian city for holding the Union Council and synod presided over by the Pope himself. The minority at Basel comprising most of the prelates, passed a decree favoring the demands of the Byzantines. The majority packed the session with priests and laymen from the neighborhood, and rejected the decree of the prelates. Eugene confirmed the decree of the prelates and transferred the Council to Ferrara, 1437. The prelates and the better part of the members withdrawing from Basel, the Council became openly schismatic. It branded as heretics all who denied the absolute superiority of a General Council over the Pope, or who asserted the right of the Pope to dissolve, suspend or transfer a General Council without its own consent. Thereupon they went through the comedy of deposing Eugene IV. In the public dancing-hall of Basel a wonderfully mixed conclave of self-constituted electors chose the retired duke Amadee of Savoy, "Felix V." to succeed Eugene IV. It was the last and most ridiculous of all schisms. The "Basilian fathers" thereafter held five sessions in three years and no session the next five years, and were finally ordered by Frederick III. to leave the city. Felix V. soon after made his peace with the Church, and the Council collapsed.

51. The XVII. General Council, the Council of Ferrara-Florence, 1438–1439. — Whilst the Council of Basel lost its best adherents, the Council of Ferrara at once assumed the greatest im-

portance. It was presided over by Eugene IV. and attended by the Greek Emperor John Palaeologus, his brother Demetrius, the Patriarch of Constantinople and the deputies of the three other Patriarchates, and a numerous train of dignitaries and theologians. After long deliberations lasting more than a year, the union was finally effected at Florence whither the Council had been transferred. The Union decree of 1439 was signed by 115 Latin and 33 Greek prelates, and dogmatically destroyed the great Eastern Schism. The Greeks accepted the dogma of the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father and the Son. Once more the united East and West gave the most solemn testimony to the Primacy of the See of St. Peter, before the storm of the Protestant Revolution broke loose. Not only the Greeks, but also the Armenians, the Copts, the Abyssinians, the Syrians, the Chaldaeans and Maronites sent their legates to the Council, and signed their respective Union decrees. Of equal importance was the Union decree to Western Christendom. "An Ecumenical Council now pronounced the Pope to be the head, not merely of individual churches, but of the Church Universal," consequently also of the General Council, "to derive his power, not from the will of the faithful" but immediately from Christ whose vicar he is, and to be not only the Father, but the Teacher to whom all Christians owe submission. This decree overcame the crisis into which the Church had entered through the great schism and the pseudo-conciliar movement.

52. **Effects of the Council of Basel.** — After the election of the antipope Felix V., Germany and France assumed an ambiguous position; Germany declared its neutrality and France acknowledged in one breath Eugene IV. and the decrees of Constance and Basel. Aeneas Sylvius Piccolomini, first an eloquent adherent of the Council of Basel and secretary of Felix V., then advocate of the German neutrality as secretary of Frederic III., soon after convinced of his errors, succeeded in reconciling the Emperor and the Empire with the Church. He subsequently ascended the papal throne as Pius II. Far greater were the evils which the Council of Basel inflicted on the ecclesiastical state of France. Charles VII. in 1438 summoned a large assembly of prelates and notables to Bourges. The assembly passed the 23 articles of the famous Pragmatic Sanction, which the king proclaimed and the parliaments registered as a fundamental law of the kingdom. The Pragmatic Sanction declared the perpetual authority of the Council of Basel and of its decrees, the superiority of every General Council over the Pope,

the duty of the Pope to summon a General Council every ten years, and other innovations of Basel. Whilst some of the articles aimed at a real reform of existing abuses, such as simony, immorality of the clergy, etc., the main result of the Sanction was to deprive the Pope of nearly all his influence in the ecclesiastical affairs of the kingdom, and to make the king all but supreme in matters of discipline. The Holy See never ceased to protest against this pernicious law, but during the lifetime of Charles VII. in vain. His successor Louis XI. first solemnly abolished the Pragmatic Sanction in the whole realm, but later yielded to the pressure of the parliaments, and allowed the courts to avail themselves of its articles in their decisions. This practice was continued by later kings till the XVIII. General Council, V. of the Lateran (1511–1517), in which Leo X. with the approval of the Council abolished the Pragmatic Sanction as corrupt, invalid and plainly schismatic. A concordat between Leo X. and Francis I. embodying the action of the Council was duly registered by the parliaments of France.

53. Restoration of the Papal Power. — The schism created at Basel opened the eyes of most of the Catholic princes who had wavered between Rome and Basel. The kings of France, Poland, Castile, Aragon, Scotland, recognized Eugene IV. Alfonso of Aragon, who for a time had withheld his recognition of the lawful Pope for political reasons, in 1442 conquered Naples, put an end to the rule of the House of Anjou, and became reconciled with Eugene IV. The duke of Milan followed his example and submitted to Eugene. In 1443 Eugene entered Rome as victor over all his enemies. His successor, Nicholas V. (1447) received the submission of Felix V., and was recognized by the whole Church. The Conciliar Movement was followed by a period of concordats, a restoration of the papal power, and a relaxation in the efforts for a general reform. Nicholas V. restored peace and order in Rome and the Patrimony without the shedding of blood. He is the founder of the Vatican library. His leading idea was the glorification of the Church of Christ through works of art and learning. This interval of peace in the constant strife and warfare of Italian cities and states was made possible by the accession of Francesco Sforza, the greatest Italian general since the days of Caesar, to the dukedom of Milan, as the son-in-law of Visconti. The unwarlike Filippo Maria Visconti had for thirty years kindled the flame of war throughout Italy; the warlike Sforza gave peace and one of the most prosperous periods to Milan. The Roman Jubilee of 1450, visited by

immense multitudes of pilgrims, was the first triumph of the Papal Restoration.

Pastor-Antrobus: *Eugene IV.; Basel and Ferrara-Florence: Popes*, vol. 1, pp. 282-361. — B. Jungmann: *De Concilio Basiliensi et de Synodo Florentina*, vol. 6, Dissert. 35, pp. 344-405. — R. Parsons: *Pope Eugenius IV. and the Council of Basel;* Studies, vol. III., p. 94; *The Council of Florence*, p. 123: *The Pontificate of Pius II., The Pragmatic Sanction of Charles VII.*, p. 160. — Creighton: *Martin V., Eugene IV., The Councils of Basel and Ferarra-Florence: Papacy*, vol. 2, pp. 3-233; *Nicholas V. and the Papal Restoration*, pp. 234-500. — Bauer, S. J.: *Die Concilien von Basel und Florence:* St., vol. 2, pp. 389 and 533; *Die Pragmatische Sanction von Bourges, ibid.*, vol. 3, p. 110; *Das V. Lateran Concil und das französische Concordat*, v. 3, p. 222. — Hefele: *Basel, Ferrara-Florence;* C. G., vol. 7, pp. 375-846; *Die temporäre Wiedervereinigung der Griechischen mit der Lateinischen Kirche; Tübinger Quartalschrift, 1830*, pp. 179-229. — Hergenroether: *Papal Infallibility in the Councils of Lyons, Constance, Basel and Florence; Cath. Church and Christ. State*, vol. 1, pp. 78-110; *From Charles IV., Charles V., ibid.*, vol. 2, pp. 66-68; *Basel, Florence and Restoration;* K. G., vol. 2, pp. 90-139. — T. P. Albert: *Papst Eugen IV.* — Reumont: *Rom*, v. 3, pp. 3-160. — Alzog-Byrne: v. 2, pp. 819-896. — Eubel: *Der Gegenpapst Nikolaus V. (Felix V.) und seine Hierarchie.* — L. v. Szalay-H. Woegerer: *Geschichte Ungarns.* — J. Chmel: *Gesch. K. Friedrichs III.*, etc.; *Regesten des röm. Kaisers Friedrich III.*, and other General Histories of Germany, Hungary and Bohemia already quoted. —

Herbert Thurston, S. J.: *The Holy Year of Jubilee.*

CHAPTER II.

THE HUNDRED YEARS' WAR AND THE WARS OF THE ROSES.

§ 1.

EDWARD II., 1307–1327.

54. The Family of Edward I.


HENRY III.
EDWARD I.
Edmund Hunchback, Earl of Lancaster, for a time candidate of the Kingdom of Sicily.
EDWARD II., m. Isabella of France, 1307–1327.
EDWARD III., 1327–1377.
Thomas, Earl of Lancaster; Henry of Lancaster.

55. Early Reign of Edward II. — Edward II., of Carnarvon, after the death of his father discarded the counsels and counsellors of Edward I., suspended the war against the Scots, and recalled to his side the favorite of his youth, Piers Gaveston, whom Edward I. had banished from the court. Before he was crowned, Edward married Isabella, the daughter of Philip the Fair, a marriage which brought untold sufferings on Edward, as well as on the whole of France and England, for it became the cause of his own overthrow, and the prelude of the Hundred Years' War.

The fact that Edward heaped lands, treasures and titles on Gaveston roused the jealousy of the barons. The ambitious Thomas, earl of Lancaster, assumed the role of Simon of Montfort without possessing his talents. The "Ordinances" of 1311, in which the barons demanded the carrying out of the Charters, the punishment of the favorite, and the restriction of royal power, were but a revival of the Provisions of Oxford (see Vol. I., No. 608).

A "Council of Ordainers" was appointed to admonish, restrain and compel the king. The Ordainers were accepted by king and Parliament. The king, however, held himself absolved from the ordinance regarding Gaveston by the compulsion under which he had given his consent, and recalled Gaveston to his side, 1312. Thereupon the barons flew to arms, captured Gaveston at Scarborough Castle, and in defiance of his terms of capitulation executed him without law or trial in the presence and with the approval of Thomas of Lancaster at Blaclow Hill. The mediation of Pope Clement V., the king of France, and the English bishops brought about a general pacification and amnesty in 1313. The Ordinances were recognized as the law of the land.

56. Affairs in Scotland and Ireland. — Meanwhile Robert Bruce took advantage of the troubles in England. The castles held by the English, Edinburgh included, fell into his hands, (1311–1313). Stirling, the last fortress garrisoned by the English, was besieged. Abandoned by Lancaster in the hour of need, Edward II. suffered a crushing defeat at Bannockburn, 1314. The battle left Bruce the master of Scotland. Stirling at once surrendered to the Scots. The work of Edward I. was undone; Scotland was no longer a dependency of England, although its independence was not yet recognized by the English king and Parliament.

The news of Bannockburn was received with enthusiasm in Ireland, and roused patriotic hopes for the recovery of Irish independence. Invited by many chiefs, Edward Bruce, the brother of king Robert, landed in Ireland at the head of 6,000 men in 1315. He was joined by a great number, though not by all, of the Irish chiefs. The barons of the Pale, too, were divided. Donald O'Neill, the prince of Tyrone, transferred his rights of the overlordship to Edward Bruce, who was crowned king of Ireland. With the assistance of his brother Robert he conquered the north of Ireland, and gradually overran nearly the whole island. The war was waged by both sides with excessive bitterness. Disease, famine, and the wanton destruction of provisions by both parties forced the Scots to return to Ulster, the stronghold of the invasion. Whilst an English incursion into Scotland called Robert home, Edward Bruce, exhausted by nineteen pitched battles, and assailed by four times his own number, lost battle, kingdom and life near Dundalk, 1318. With Bruce fell the hopes of the Irish patriots. The English Parliament redressed a few grievances at the earnest solicitation of John XXII., but the old

system of depredation and revenge, and the wholesale destruction of property caused during the invasion, left the nation for a long time in a state of disorder and misery.

57. Fall of Thomas of Lancaster. — As the king was powerless after his defeat at Bannockburn, Thomas of Lancaster, now earl of five earldoms, ruled England at his pleasure and for his own aggrandizement. The barons split up into parties, and inaugurated a period of private warfare until the siege and capture of Berwick by Robert Bruce in 1318 put a truce to their factional wrangling. Thomas' second refusal to follow the king in his disastrous expedition to Berwick, weakened his own influence. Meanwhile a new favorite, Hugh the Dispenser, was gaining the confidence of the king. His father, the elder Hugh the Dispenser, did his best to form a party in support of the king. But a baronial Parliament under the influence of Lancaster drove the Dispensers into exile. The king stood by his friends. An insult offered the queen — greeted with a shower of arrows at her dower castle at Leeds, where she intended to pass the night — roused the chivalrous feeling of the nation, and enabled the king to gather a strong and loyal following around his person. The clergy declared the sentence against the Dispensers illegal. The king conducted the campaign against the rebel lords with great energy. Thomas of Lancaster was defeated and taken prisoner, tried and condemned as a traitor, and at once beheaded in his own castle of Pomfret, 1322. About thirty barons and bishops were executed and many more were imprisoned or paid fines and forfeitures. A Parliament at York restored the Dispensers, repealed the Ordinances of 1311, and enacted the important provision, that all laws concerning "the estate of our lord, the king and his heirs, or the estate of the realm and the people, shall be treated, accorded, and established in Parliaments by our Lord, the King and by the consent of the Prelates, Earls, Barons, and Commonalty of the realm, according as hath been hitherto accustomed." The mere custom introduced by Edward I. of summoning the Commons to Parliament, became thereby a law.

58. **The Fall of Edward II.** — The rest of the reign of Edward II. was characterized by arrogance on the part of the Dispensers, helplessness on the

part of the king and unjustifiable and almost universal treachery. The king's own wife Isabella became the most guilty of the traitors. In the Tower she became acquainted with one of the most dangerous rebels, Roger Mortimer, and helped him to escape. She then made the king send her to France, ostensibly to settle a difficulty about Guienne with her brother Charles the Fair. At her request the unsuspecting king sent also his son, the prince of Wales, to France. Her paramour Mortimer had already followed her. While her agents poisoned the minds of the people against the king, the faithless wife organized a force for the invasion of England.

Isabella landed in 1326. Henry of Lancaster, Thomas' brother and many nobles and bishops joined her in her unopposed march to London. The king fled westward whither the queen followed him. At Bristol young Edward was proclaimed guardian of the kingdom, an act which was preceded and followed by the execution of the Dispensers and other friends of the betrayed king. Edward II. himself fell into the hands of his pursuers. A Parliament of Westminster, summoned under his seal, deposed him and chose young Edward of Windsor king. Edward II. was forced to sign his abdication and eight months later was foully murdered in Berkeley Castle. England was punished for four years by the insulting rule of Isabella, "the She-Wolf of France," and her paramour Mortimer.

No acts of injustice or oppression were imputed to Edward II. by his greatest enemies. His chief faults were errors of judgment. He was pious and moral in his family life; but indolent and remiss as king, allowing the cares of government to devolve on his favorites. Factious nobles regarded the rise of a favorite as their own depression, and sacrificed the king to their pride and vengeance.

Books for Consultation. — Lingard: *Edward II.: Hist. of England* (American Edit.), vol. 3, ch. 4. — Green: *Edward II.: Hist. of the Engl. People*, Book IV., ch. 1 — Stubbs: *Edward II.: Early Plantagenets.* — Gardiner: *Edward II.: Student's Hist. of England*, vol. 1, pp. 224–231. — A. Strickland: *Isabella of France: Queens of England.* — *The Lennox* (to Bruce) E. R., '79, 1, p. 269. — Maxwell: *Wars of England and Scotland.* — Sir Walter Scott: *Tales of a Grand-father.* — *Histories of Scotland* by S. W. Scott; J. M. Ross; Kinloch; J. H. Burton. — Round: *Bannockburn.*

§ 2.

EDWARD III. AND PHILIP VI. OF VALOIS.

59. The Independence of Scotland. — In 1323 Edward II. had concluded with Scotland a truce of thirteen years, and silently

admitted the assumption of the royal title by Robert Bruce. In order to obtain a definite peace Robert Bruce invaded England with two armies. Young Edward III. marched north to meet the invaders with no better success than his father. Mortimer, the real ruler of England, saw himself compelled to make peace with Scotland. By the treaty of Northampton England recognized the complete independence of Scotland and formally acknowledged Robert as king. The compact was sealed by the betrothal of David, only son of king Robert I., to the princess Joan, sister of Edward III.

Robert I., "the Bruce," was one of the greatest monarchs who ever wore the Scottish crown. Naturally religious, chivalrous, and full of enthusiasm in the cause of his country's independence, his subsequent virtues atoned for the murder of Comyn committed in an outburst of passion. Unlike Edward I., he treated the enemies that came into his power with great generosity. Like Edward I. he harbored to the end the hope of undertaking a Crusade, and on his deathbed commissioned his faithful friend, James, earl of Douglas, to bear his heart to the Holy Land.

60. **Fall of Mortimer, 1330.** — Edward III. was surrounded by a nominal council of regency, while the real power was wielded by Mortimer and Isabella. The peace of Northampton increased the revulsion of popular feeling which had set in after the murder of Edward II. The most prominent men of the kingdom withdrew from the council of regency. To terrorize the princes of the blood, Mortimer sent the earl of Kent, a half-brother of Edward II., to the block. Gradually Edward's eyes were opened to the real character of Isabella's favorite. In 1330 he one night surprised Mortimer and the queen in Nottingham Castle. Mortimer was at once tried by a parliament at Westminster, and executed, the first at Tyburn. Isabella was spared the ignominy of a public trial through the intercession of John XXII. who exhorted the son not to expose the shame of his mother. She spent the twenty-seven years of her widowhood in easy captivity at Rising Castle. The family of Mortimer was not disinherited, and his heirs retained the title of the earls of March.

61. Scotch Wars. — The war with Scotland again broke out in 1332. Twice within two years Edward Balliol, the son of the ex-king (see vol. I., nos. 613 and 617), was introduced by English forces into the kingdom; the second time Edward III. nearly annihilated the Scotch army at Halidon Hill, 1333. But twice the pretender was driven across the frontiers. Young David II., the son of Robert Bruce, a boy of eight years, had meanwhile been sent to France,

where he remained for nearly ten years. It was the assistance which Philip VI. lent the Scots that determined Edward III. to raise his claim to the French crown, a claim which involved the two countries in a war extending over a period of a hundred and sixteen years, and sowed the seeds of national antipathy lasting to the present day.

62. French Succession and Claim of Edward III.


PHILIP THE BOLD, son of St. Louis, d. 1285.
PHILIP IV. THE FAIR, d. 1314.
Charles of Valois.
LOUIS X., d. 1316.
PHILIP V., d. 1322.
CHARLES IV., d. 1328.
ISABELLA, m. EDWARD II.
Joan, Queen of Navarre.
EDWARD III.
PHILIP VI., first King of the House of VALOIS.
Charles the Bad, of Navarre.

From Hugh Capet to Louis X. the French crown had descended from father to son. With Charles IV. died the last direct Capetian, and the last son of Philip the Fair. The punishment for the sacrilege of Anagni had visited his House; fourteen years after the death of Philip the Fair, not a son, nor a grandson of his was alive. The crown passed over to the side line of the Valois.— Edward III., in founding his claim on the marriage of his father with Isabella of France, admitted that according to the Salic law his mother was incapable of succeeding, but he maintained that she was capable of transmitting the succession to her male offspring. Yet even on this principle Edward had no claim in 1337, for Charles the Bad of Navarre, descended from the *eldest* son of Philip the Fair, stood nearer to the direct Capetian line than himself. But the principle was never admitted in France. The Twelve Peers of France, the greatest authority during a vacancy, had decided that the crown devolved on Philip of Valois. Edward had recognized the title without reservation in 1331 by doing homage to Philip for Guienne.

63. Preparations of Edward III. — It was, however, Philip VI. who drove the English king into war by attacking English shipping, plundering the Isle of Wight, and attempting to annex the remaining English possessions in Aquitaine to the crown. Meanwhile Edward pushed on his preparations by land and sea, and formed alliances with Robert of Artois who, deprived of his county by the French king, had fled to Edward's court; with Ludwig the Bavarian and the German princes, whose territories touched the borders of France; and with the Flemings who, being in need of English

wool, rose against their count, a vassal and partisan of Philip VI. The leader of the movement was Jacob van Arteveld, a Flemish nobleman, who had ingratiated himself with the trade-guilds, by becoming a member of the brewers' guilds of Ghent. Not willing to fight against "the king of France," the Flemings in a parliament of cities and barons called on Edward "to take on him the name of king of France, and to quarter the arms of France with those of England."

Thus Edward after some hesitation revived the claim which he had formerly abandoned. To meet the enormous expenses of the intended expedition, he had recourse to forced loans, seizures of wool, "arrests" of ships, and similar expedients, which the patriotic pride of the nation, now fairly aroused, admitted, but usually accompanied with petitions for a redress of grievances. During Edward's long reign petitions of Parliament, promises to redress grievances made and broken, and new taxes and loans followed each other in constant succession.

64. Beginning of the War. — Edward declared war against Philip in 1337. His first campaign in northern France was a failure. Supplies were insufficient, the allies were lukewarm; the Germans deserted. But his brilliant naval victory off Sluys in 1340 brought him great renown as "lord of the English seas." The French navy was almost annihilated. A truce of two years ended this expedition after Edward's failure to take Tournay.

He now turned his attention to Scotland, where the cause of David under the leadership of Robert the Steward and Sir William Douglass had made splendid progress. Arriving too late to save Stirling and Edinburg, Edward concluded a truce of two years, during which David was able to return to his kingdom (1342) and to win back the chief fortresses of the Lowlands. From that moment the freedom of Scotland was secured. The war ceased to be a war of conquest on the one hand and patriotic resistance on the other, and became a mere episode in the greater strife between England and France.

65. Campaign and Battle of Crécy, 1346. — From 1341 to the end of 1345 the war assumed a desultory character. There was fighting in Aquitaine and Brittany. In 1345 Edward received the news that his staunchest adherent on the continent, van Arteveld, suspected of sacrificing the interests of Flanders to the English cause, had been murdered by a mob in Ghent. He at once equipped a powerful armament, and accompanied by Edward, prince of Wales,

landed with 30,000 men in Normandy near Cape La Hogue. Devastating right and left, yet scrupulously sparing church property, he advanced along the Seine, intending to reach Calais. Finding every bridge between Rouen and Paris demolished, he came within five leagues of Paris, followed by the French army twice as numerous as his own. Crossing the river Somme, he halted near Crécy in Ponthieu, to accept battle. The day of Crécy was decided in favor of the English by the admirable arrangement which Edward gave to his forces, the valor of the prince of Wales, and the deadly efficiency of the English archery, 1346.

The battle was a brilliant victory of infantry over cavalry, and dealt a decisive blow at the feudal system of warfare, resting on the superiority of the horseman over the footman. Philip VI. had his horse killed under him, and, twice wounded, had to be dragged from the battle-field, when the day was already lost. Twelve sovereign princes and 1,300 knights were slain by the English, among them the blind king John of Bohemia, who with his son Charles IV., had fought on the side of France, and had astonished friend and foe by his dauntless valor. Edward marched to Calais and sat down to the siege. The north of France was devastated by 100,000 Flemings. Never before had France suffered a similar disaster.

66. Neville's Cross, 1346, and Calais, 1347 — Black Death. — Two months after the battle of Crécy prince Lionel, the second son of Edward III., defeated an invading army of Scots at Neville's Cross chiefly by the aid of his archers, and David Bruce and Douglas were conveyed as prisoners of war to London. The following year Calais was starved into a surrender, and repeopled with Englishmen. It remained in the possession of England till the reign of Mary Tudor. A truce with France mediated by papal legates enabled Edward to return to England. The immense treasures captured in this campaign produced in England a sudden prosperity and a series of gay festivities, which were as suddenly turned into woe by the breaking out of the Black Death (1348–49), which swept away one-half if not two-thirds of the population.

The plague dissolved all social ties. The instinct of self-preservation in most cases proved stronger than duty and charity. The monks and friars and heroic sisterhoods were almost the only classes that defied the grim destroyer, and sacrificed their lives in the service of the plague-stricken. An important economic change followed in the wake of the Black Death.

Long before its outbreak a tendency had set in in England of substituting money rents for manual service and of employing hired labor for tilling the land. When the plague carried away one-half of the laborers, the survivors demanded higher wages. The employers, the owners of large estates in the House of Lords and the small gentry in the House of Commons opposed the demand and passed the first Statute of Laborers fixing the scale of wages under heavy penalties, 1349. The statute, often renewed with increased penalties, was invariably evaded or resisted by the laborers and only served to introduce an element of discord between employers and employees.

Lingard: *Edward III.*, vol. III., chs. 1 and 2. — Green: *Edward III.:* Book IV., ch. 2. — Gardiner: *From the Accession of Edward III. to the Treaty of Bretigny*, I., pp. 231-254. — Warburton: *Edward III. (Epochs).* — A. Strickland: *Philippa of Hainault.* — G. W. Kitchin: *The Forebodings of the Hundred Years' War, Hist. of France*, vol. 1, pp. 403-411. — *The Hundred Years' War, First Period, 1337-1360*, pp. 412-460. — Crowe: *Hist. of France.* — Guizot: *The Communes and the Third Estate: Popular Hist. of France*, vol. II., ch. 19; *The Hundred Years' War; Philip VI. and John II.*, ch. 20. — Baron Kervyn de Lettenhove: *Histoire de Flandre.*— (On Scotland see, § 1.) — H. B. George: *The Archers at Crécy:* E. H. R. v. 10, p. 733. — J. E. Morris: *The Archers at Crécy:* E. H. R., v. 12, p. 427. — Oman: *Art of War in the Middle Ages* (to Crécy). — Maxwell: *Battle History.* — T. A. Gasquet: *The Great Pestilence, 1348-49, The Black Death.*— Creighton: *Epidemics in Britain.* — Ashley: *English Economic Hist.* — Cunningham: *Growth of English Industry and Commerce.* — (On *the Flagellants in France, etc.*: — Lechner: H, P. B. v. 5, p. 457). — H. Dowell: *A History of Taxation, etc.* — Rogers: *Six Centuries of Work and Wages.*

§ 3.

EDWARD III. AND JOHN THE GOOD (1350–1364).

67. New Invasions in France and Scotland. — Philip VI. died in 1350, and was succeeded by his son, John the Good, so called for his bravery, gaiety and devotedness to his favorites. Already as duke of Normandy he had gained the reputation for the scrupulous veracity which he maintained so well as king of France. As soon as the truce had run out in 1355, Edward carried out the design of a triple invasion. Henry of Lancaster entered Brittany to assist the Monforts, who claimed the duchy against Charles of Blois. Edward III. invaded France by way of Calais, and laid waste Picardy and Artois, but hastened back to punish a Scotch invasion. The Lothians long remembered his ravages of 1356, and adopted the cry of "burnt Candlemas" as a war cry against England. At Edinburgh, however, the progress of the English was turned into a disastrous retreat. The following year king David was released for a ransom of 100,000 marks. Before Edward hastened to Scotland, the Black Prince, as the Prince of Wales was now called on account of the sable color of his armor, had effected a third landing at Bordeaux, whence he opened a campaign of devastation in which 500 places in a populous district were laid in ashes.

68. The Battle of Poitiers, 1356. — Through the liberal supply granted by the States General, John the Good was enabled to lead a mighty army to Poitiers against the Black Prince, who suddenly found himself and his 8,000 Englishmen cut off from Bordeaux, his only base of operations. He had just time to select a splendid position. The benevolent efforts of Cardinal Talleyrand, legate of Innocent VI., to mediate a treaty which saved the honor of the English, — the only condition asked by the Black Prince — was frustrated by John's advisers, who relied on their 60,000 men, among them the chivalry of France. The compact force of the English posted on a hill surrounded with hedges, offering the enemy only a narrow lane as approach, and the skill of the English archers again won the day against an army overwhelming in numbers, but ill handled and badly posted. "The heroism of the French king, who stood, battle-axe in hand in the thickest of the fight, dealing his blows right and left, his little son Philip crouching close behind him with his arms around his father's waist, warning him against unsuspected thrusts, and the bravery of his body-guard of nobles saved the honor of France at Poitiers, where all but life and honor was lost." Twice wounded in the face and at length struck down, John surrendered to an English knight and was conveyed to the Black Prince, who courteously awarded him the prize of honor over the best knights of France.

Charles, duke of Normandy, the king's eldest son, acting as regent during the imprisonment of his father, concluded a truce with the Black Prince. Charles was called Dauphin since 1349, when he obtained the Dauphiny, the region of Vienne, through the abdication of its last count. King John and little Philip, who later became renowned as Philip the Bold of Burgundy, accompanied the Black Prince to England as prisoners of war, and were royally received in London. King John soon found himself at Hertford Castle in company with king David who had not yet departed for Scotland.

69. Civil War in France — The Jacquerie. — The four years from Poitiers to the Peace of Bretigny were years of disaster for France. English and French marauders, disbanded troopers, ravaged up and down the country. The city of Paris, swayed by Etienne Marcel, the provost of the merchants, clamored for civic and financial reforms. The States General organized a council of thirty-six members after the fashion of the English Ordainers (see no. 53) and took nearly all the power out of the hands of the dauphin. Charles the Bad of Navarre, whom king John had imprisoned

for treason, was released by Marcel's party; his reappearance on the scene kindled a civil war. The brutal murder of three high officers of the kingdom by the Parisians under Marcel's leadership drove the regent from the city. Meanwhile a more formidable insurrection, *the Jacquerie*, had broken out in the open country. The nobles extorted the ransoms incurred for their release at Crécy and Poitiers from the peasants. Hence the weight of these disasters fell most heavily on "Jacques Bonhomme," as the peasant and common man was called. The number of the insurgents gradually swelled to 100,000. They had no political object, no common plan, no intelligent leader. Inspired with a blind passion for wholesale destruction, they butchered their lords and fired their castles all over the north and west of France. Etienne Marcel made common cause with the Jacquerie. When the nobles awoke from the stunning effect of this rising, they suppressed the outbreak with equal ferocity. On the approach of the regent at the head of an army, Marcel offered the keys of Paris and the crown of France to Charles of Navarre. But when Marcel's designs were discovered, the party loyal to the House of Valois rose and murdered him. A period of anarchy followed between the companies of the regent and those of Charles of Navarre. Yet desperate as the state of France was, the regent rejected a treaty concluded between Edward III. and John the Good, which would have given nearly one-half of France to England. Thereupon Edward again invaded France, but want of provisions in the wasted country forced him to retreat.

70. The Peace of Bretigny, 1360. — The exhaustion of both France and England, and the disinterested efforts of Innocent VI. led at length to the Peace of Bretigny. By this peace Edward promised to renounce all claims to the throne of France and to the ancient possessions of the Plantagenets *north* of the Loire: Normandy, Brittany, Maine, Anjou, Touraine, on condition of a similar renunciation by France of all sovereignty over the rest of the Anjou inheritance *south* of the Loire: Gascony, Guienne, Poitou, (besides Calais and Ponthieu). A ransom of 3,000,000 gold crowns was to be paid for the release of king John. Thus John the Good returned to France, and was joyfully welcomed by his subjects. The ceded provinces were gradually handed over to England, but the renunciations promised in the treaty were never made.

The return of France to prosperity was retarded by the free companies of soldiers discharged from both armies. Wishing to free the country from these rovers, king John conceived the plan of leading them in a Crusade to the Holy Land. But an unforeseen event gave his thoughts a new direction One of his sons, the duke of Anjou, was detained at Calais under parole to Edward III., as hostage for his father. Unmindful of the claims

of honor he escaped and refused to return. This breach of faith so grieved John the Good that he voluntarily returned into captivity to London, only to die three months after his landing, 1364. The regent succeeded as king Charles V., and was surnamed "The Wise," on account of his prudent, cautious and dissembling policy. John's other son, "Little Philip," had been invested by his father with the vacant dukedom of Burgundy, 1363. As Philip the Bold of Burgundy he laid the foundation of the power, which his House came to enjoy in the Netherlands, by his marriage with the heiress of Flanders.

Lingard, etc., loco citato. — W. Longman: *Hist. of Edward III.* — Ashley: *Edward III. and His Wars.* — Kitchin: *Etienne Marcel and the Bourgoisie of Paris, 1356-1360,* and *The Peace of Bretigny; Hist. of France,* vol. 1, pp. 445-463. — A. Thierry: *Formation and Progress of the Tiers Etat,* vol. 1. — Perrens: *Etienne Marcel; La Democratie au XIV. siécle.* — S. Luce: *Histoire de la Jacquerie.* — De Vericour: *The Jacquerie; (Royle Hist. Soc. Transactions,* vol. 1). — Secousse: *Preuves de l'histoire de Charles Mauvais; Memoires, etc., de Ch. le Mauvais.* — Aubert: *Le Parliament de Paris, 1314-1422.* — Guizot: *The States General of the 14th Century; Pop. Hist.* — G. Pigot: *Histoire des Etats Généraux.* — Jusserand: *The Romance of a King's Life* (to James I.). — *Works on Scotland,* § 1.

§ 4.

EDWARD III. AND CHARLES THE WISE.

71. Spanish Campaign of the Black Prince, 1369. — With Charles V. began the second period of the Hundred Years' War. Whilst the king, disabled by his physical infirmities from active service in the field, concentrated his energy upon the reform of the country's finances, he intrusted the conduct of the war to Bertrand du Guesclin. This rising general or rather captain of free companies owed it to his utter fearlessness that the king gradually raised him to the post of constable, or commander-in-chief of the French army. A crown dispute in Castile offered an opportunity both to give employment to the troublesome free companies and to weaken the English power in the south, where the Black Prince ruled as duke of Aquitaine. Castile was in the hands of Pedro the Cruel, a monster in human form. Urban V. excommunicated him for his crimes and awarded the crown to his half-brother, Henry Trastamare. With the secret encouragement of Charles the Wise, Bertrand du Guesclin invaded Castile with an army of freebooters, and supported by the Castilian nobles expelled Pedro from the country. Pedro fled to his ally, the Black Prince. Though warned by his best advisers, the Prince upon the promise of a compensation of 600,000 gold crowns undertook to restore the tyrant, and entered Castile. He won the battle of Navarette — the hardest fought of his life — but lost four-fifths of his army, contracted a fatal disease, and found his demands for the promised compensation treated with scorn by Pedro the Cruel. Overwhelmed with debts he returned to Aquitaine (1367). In 1368 Henry of Trastamare re-entered Cas-

tile, defeated and slew Pedro, and undid the whole work of the Black Prince in Spain. In France the result of this campaign was that England lost whatever she had gained in the Peace of Bretigny.

72. Bertrand du Guesclin — English Losses in France. — The efforts of the Black Prince to repair his finances by the tax of one franc on every hearth exasperated the nobles of Aquitaine. They appealed to Charles the Wise. The French king summoned the Black Prince before his court, 1369, on the pretext that he was still the feudal lord of Aquitaine, as the renunciations of Bretigny had not yet been ratified. The offer of Edward III. now to ratify the Peace of Bretigny was answered by a declaration of war, whereupon Edward III. resumed the title of king of France. The armies of Charles V. under du Guesclin were soon overrunning the south of France, hanging about the English march and capturing exposed towns but carefully avoiding pitched battles. In retaking Limoges the Black Prince ordered the indiscriminate slaughter of over 3,000 men, women and children, a deed which left a blot on the "Christian Hector," as friend and foe used to call him. Soon after he crossed to England to languish out the last years of his life. His brother, John of Gaunt, continued the war without success. The ships of Henry Trastamare, who had allied himself with France, sunk a whole English fleet together with the treasure-ship bearing the enormous sums which Edward had extorted from the Church. In the desultory warfare which ensued, du Guesclin won victory after victory, took city after city. Every year the English territories in France shrank within narrower limits. At last the legates of Gregory XI. succeeded in mediating a truce, 1374, which subsequently was prolonged to the death of Edward III. Thus the fabric of power and prosperity raised by Edward crumbled away in his last years. Calais, Bordeaux, Bayonne and a few other districts in France, and Berwick in Scotland, were the only remnants of his conquests.

73. Last Years of Edward III. — In the last years of Edward III. the English court became a scene of the vilest intrigues. Worn out before his time, the king fell under the influence of Alice Perrers, a greedy and unscrupulous mistress. John of Gaunt, by marrying Blanche, the daughter and heiress of Henry of Lancaster, had become duke of Lancaster. Allied with Alice Perrers and supported by John Wyclif and his followers, the selfish and unprincipled duke placed himself at the head of an anti-clerical party

of barons, and became the first man in the kingdom. To deprive the prelates not only of their political power, but of a great part of their ecclesiastical property, was the avowed aim of this faction. But when it began to be rumored that Lancaster intended to reach out for the crown at the expense of young Richard, the son of the Black Prince, the latter roused himself from his lethargy and joined the House of Commons, and by his popularity baffled the designs of the Lancaster party. The Black Prince died in the same year, 1376.

74. **France under Charles V.** — France under Charles the Wise had passed through a terrible agony. The people were still heavily burdened by the octroi or tax on all salable property, the hearth-tax and the gabelle or salt tax, taxes always hated by the people and always imposed by the rulers of France. But at the close of his reign, 1380, the government of France was powerful and respected, her enemies were expelled or humbled, her credit was restored, and her past disasters were repaired or in a fair way of reparation.

75. Ireland — The Statute of Kilkenny, 1367. — Under the brief rule of Edward Bruce, the English Pale had been considerably contracted and a large number of Irishmen had regained their lands. In the outlying parts of the Pale the Irish more and more absorbed the English, as the English had absorbed the Normans. English nobles were constantly adopting Irish customs and making common cause with the native population. To check this tendency Edward III. added new aggravations and insults to the oppressive ordinances by which English legislation for Ireland had hitherto been disgraced. He declared void every grant of land made since the time of Edward II. and removing the "English by blood," who were friendly to the Irish, granted their lands to new holders, the "English by birth." This measure naturally introduced a new element of strife into the divided country. Prince Lionel, who had an insane hatred of the Irish, was sent over in 1361, but was unable to secure the ascendency to the English by birth. When he came again as lord lieutenant in 1367, he summoned a Parliament of English colonists, loyal to the mother-country, which enacted the famous Statute of Kilkenny. The statute, framed entirely in the interest of the English, re-enacted the monstrous law, which since 1357 prohibited marriage between the Irish and the English under penalty of treason, *i. e.*, of death, forbade the adoption of the Irish language, name or dress by any man

of English blood, prohibited the national games, and abolished the use of the ancient code by which the Brehons had decided cases since Ireland's conversion to Christianity. An Irishman, by the mere fact of his nationality, was practically outside the protection of the law before an English court. Such measures increased and perpetuated the exasperation of the race, which had "far too much pride, courage, elasticity and genius" to be enslaved; but it proved fruitless to check the fusion of the races.

Lingard; Green: l. c. — Gardiner: *Edward III. after the Peace of Bretigny*, v. 1, pp. 254–265. — W. Longman: *The History of the Life and Times of Edward III.; Life and Times of Edward III.*, E. R. '69, p. 534. — C. W. Colby: *The Growth of Oligarchy in English Towns*, E. H. R., v. 5, p. 633. — Kitchin: *The Deeds of Charles V., the Wise; 2d Period of Hundred Years' War: Hist. of France*, vol. 1, ch. 3, pp. 464–485. — Guizot: *The Hundred Years' War; Charles V., Pop. His.*, v. 2, ch. 22. — F. Wright: *Hist. of France*, and other *Gen. Hist. of France*. — D. F. Jameson: *Life and Times of Bertrand du Guesclin*. — S. Luce: *Hist. de Bertrand du Guesclin*. — P. Merimée: *History of Peter the Cruel*. — M. Moisant: *Le Prince Noir en Aquitaine*. — Brissaud: *Les Anglais en Guyenne*. — Joyce: *Short Hist.* and other *Histories of Ireland*. — Hutton: *James and Philip van Arteveld*. — C. M. Davies: *Hist. of Holland*.

§ 5.

RICHARD II., 1377–1399.

76. The Sons of Edward III.

EDWARD III., 1327–1377.

1. *Edward*, The Black Prince, d. 1376.	2. *William*.	3. *Lionel*, Duke of Clarence, d. 1394.	4. *John of Gaunt*, (because born at Ghent) D. of *Lancaster*, d. 1394.	5. *Edmund*, Duke of *York*, d. 1402.	6. *Thomas*. Duke of *Gloucester*, d. 1397.
RICHARD II., 1377–1399.					

77. Causes of the Wat Tyler Insurrection.— Richard II., the son of the Black Prince, was twelve years old when he succeeded his grandfather. During his minority a council of regency including York and Gloucester under the leadership of John of Gaunt controlled the government. Only four years after his accession the boy-king had to face a great danger. The disastrous warfare in France made a high rate of taxation unavoidable. It took the obnoxious form of a poll-tax levied on every person in the realm. The landlords, unable to force the low wages provided for by the statute of laborers upon the villeins, fell back upon the old system of demanding bodily service. The discontent caused by these grievences was fomented by the followers of Wyclif (see No. 25). John Ball, for twenty years an

adherent of the heresiarch, and numerous other itinerant preachers, went up and down the country spreading the new gospel: "Be no man's servants; pay no taxes to Church and State, you are as good as your neighbor." The object of the peasants, according to the confession of John Ball, was to seize the king and make him their tool, and then to murder the lords spiritual and temporal, the monks, the canons and rectors of parishes. Wyclif was directing the whole plan from his comfortable vicarage of Lutherworth.

78. The Wat Tyler Rebellion, 1381.— The peasants of Essex were the first to rise, under Jack Straw. The Kentishmen were led by Wat Tyler whose daughter had been insulted by a tax collector. They marched to London, slaying everywhere judges, lawyers and jurors and burning charters and title deeds. They had swelled to a mob of 100,000 when they reached the capital. The court took refuge in the Tower. Reinforced by the released prisoners and the rabble of London, the insurgents burned down the Savoy, the palace of the duke of Lancaster, ruined the Temple with its law-courts and records, the houses of all the lawyers they could find, and dragged the people out of the churches to murder them in the streets. One party marched to the Tower and beheaded the Archbishop of Canterbury. When he remonstrated with the mob saying that he was a priest and Arcbbishop, the murderers in true Wyclif fashion answered that he was a sinner, and therefore could be no true priest.

79. Suppression of the Rebellion. — Meanwhile the young king who exhibited great personal courage during these days of terror, met the mob at Mile-End, promised them to abolish villeinage, issued charters of manumission, and thus induced the Essex men quietly to return to their homes. The following day the king, accompanied by Walworth, the mayor of London and a strong body guard, went out to meet Wat Tyler, who had remained with 30,000 rebels. During a parley Tyler dared to threaten the person of the king, when he was struck down by Walworth. The fall of the leader put a stop to the rising in London and drove the peasants from the city. From Essex the insurrection had spread into Suffolk, Cambridgeshire, Norfolk and other parts of England. An army of 40,000 enabled the king to suppress the rising and to punish a great

number of the rebels. The ringleaders were hanged without mercy. The insurrection created a powerful reaction against Wyclifism, and united the nobility and clergy in the defense of social order against anarchy. Although Parliament canceled the promises of the king concerning villeinage, yet as a matter of fact the landlords themselves gave up demanding base services from the tenants and accepted money payments in place of labor. After his display of energy in the Wat Tyler insurrection, the king again placed himself under the tutelage of the court party.

80. The Merciless Parliament. — The domestic policy of Edward III. now began to bear its fruit. Thomas, duke of Gloucester, having supplanted his brothers of Lancaster and York, was watching for a chance to seize the crown. A self-constituted Parliament of his party forced upon the king the "Continual Council" headed by the wealthy, turbulent and ambitious duke, which deprived the king of all his powers. Richard and his friends declared the proceedings of Gloucester's Parliament illegal. Thereupon five lords, Gloucester himself, and the earls of Arundel, Warwick, Nottingham and Derby, the latter the son of John of Gaunt, "appealed" the king's ministers, i. e., impeached them of high treason, and for this reason were called the "Lords Appellant." Backed by an army of 40,000 men they marched to London and forced a bill of impeachment, in all its parts informal and illegal, through a factional Parliament, known as the "Merciless Parliament." A number of the king's officers and friends were either executed or banished or fled from the country, 1388. The prelates had left the sessions before the bloody decrees were passed. Gloucester enjoyed his triumph but for a short time. Richard II. one fine morning in 1389 declared himself of age, and took the government into his own hands. Gloucester retired grumbling to his estates. The power of the Lords Appellant was broken, and the country enjoyed for eight years the wise, moderate and constitutional rule of Richard II.

81. New Conspiracies. — The charge of a new conspiracy brought against the duke of Gloucester and the earls of Arundel and Warwick was followed by the arrest of the three. The earl of Arundel, in whose house the conspirators were said to have met, was beheaded. Warwick, who owned the charge but named the duke of Gloucester as the head of the conspiracy, was condemned to perpetual imprisonment. The duke of Gloucester was conveyed to Calais, where he soon after died (by murder?) confessing his treason. The two remaining Appellants, the earls of Derby and Nottingham, apparently enjoyed the king's favor, and were made dukes of Hereford and Norfolk. The Parliament of Shrewsbury, 1397, annulled the proceedings of the "Merciless Parliament," and delegated its power to a permanent

committee of twelve Lords and six Commons. Before the end of the year, a quarrel between the two remaining Appellants, in which the king's good faith regarding the sincerity of his pardons was questioned, led to the imprudent sentence which banished Norfolk for life and Hereford for six years from the kingdom. The right of inheriting the Lancaster estates was, however, reserved to the banished duke.

82. Usurpation of the House of Lancaster.

EDWARD III.

John of Gaunt m. *Blanche of Lancaster.*

Henry,
(1) Earl of Derby, (2) made Duke of Hereford by Richard II., 1397, (3) Duke of Lancaster, by the death of his father, 1398, (4) as King **HENRY IV.**, 1399–1413.

Henry V. m. Catharine of France, 1413–1422.

Henry VI. m. Margaret of Anjou, 1422–1471.

83. The Fall of Richard II. — The last two years of Richard II.'s reign showed a decided change for the worse, his mind, it seems, becoming unbalanced. Whilst preparing for an expedition to Ireland, where the lords of the Pale had made themselves almost independent of England, the king surrounded himself with a vast number of armed retainers, compelled counties to set their seals to "blank charters" or promissory notes without knowing to what amount they made themselves liable, needlessly offended the powerful House of the Percies, and upon the death of John of Gaunt, 1398, confiscated the duchy of Lancaster, the inheritance of the banished duke of Hereford, Henry of Lancaster. While the king was absent in Ireland, Henry landed in Yorkshire and gathered a force to "claim his inheritance." Marching south his forces increased and Henry was everywhere joined by the nobles. Even the regent, Edward of York, with his army went over to him, when he declared he came merely "to claim his inheritance and to remove the evil counsellors of the king." At Chester he swore on the Blessed Sacrament that he would neither rebel nor be a party to the

king's deposition. Nevertheless the king's friends were executed or removed. Henry thus became master of London and England without a blow. On returning from Ireland Richard saw his last two armies pass over to his nephew, and made no attempt to stem the tide of desertion and ingratitude. Made prisoner through the treachery of the earl of Northumberland, the head of the Percies, the king was conveyed to the Tower and forced to sign a document of unconditional resignation. The Parliament summoned in his name pronounced his deposition, and enthroned Henry of Lancaster as a descendant of Henry III. on the strength of a forged pedigree, setting aside the heirs of Lionel, duke of Clarence, who had a better right. Thus the House of Lancaster came to the throne by a two-fold usurpation.

Richard II. had been, on the whole, a peaceful king. He had in him nothing of the tyrant he was represented to be. He was accused of disasters on the continent, which he had not the power to avoid. The question raised by his ambitious kinsmen was, whether the king's power was to be treated as a reality or a fiction.

Lingard: *Richard II.*, vol. 4, ch. 3. — Green: ch. 4, *The Peasant Revolt*, Book 4; ch. 5; *Richard II.* — Gardiner: *Richard II. and the Social and Political Revolution*, vol. 1, pp. 266–286. — Strickland: *Anne of Bohemia; Isabella of Valois. — Statute of Labourers, 1349:* Henderson: *Sel. Hist. Documents.* — Smith: *Troublous Days of Richard II.* — Edgar Powell: *The Rising in East Anglia in 1381.* — Stubbs: *Constitutional History of England Under Edward II., Edward III., and Richard II.*, vol. 2, chs. 16 and 17. — M. H. Allies: *Schism, Heresy and Insurrection; The Church in England*, vol. 1, pp. 275–299. — Hall; Holinshed: *Chronicles.* — Froissart: *Chronicles of England, France and Spain from Edward III. to Henry IV.* — James Gairdner: *The Houses of Lancaster and York.*

§ 6.

THE HOUSE OF LANCASTER, 1399–1461. HENRY IV. AND HENRY V.

84. Henry IV.; Bolingbroke, 1399–1413, and the Nobles. — Henry IV. found it difficult to defend the crown which he had won by usurpation. The nobles opposed to him rose in 1400, but were defeated with the aid of the townsmen and yeomen, who butchered without mercy the barons that fell into their hands. The life of Richard formed a standing danger for the new king; accordingly he was starved to death or, as others say, slain with an axe in Pomfret Castle by Henry's orders. The young earl of March, Lionel's heir, was detained in prison. The Welsh who had borne great love to Richard II., rose in the whole country to recover their independence. Their native leader, Owen Glendower, assumed the title of Prince of Wales. Aided by French auxiliaries Owen was victorious for some years, and it was not

until the reign of Henry V. that the English succeeded in crushing the insurrection in all Wales. In 1402 the Scotch earl of Douglas invaded England, was defeated and captured by the Percies, but not surrendered to the English king. The Percies, the earl of Northumberland, his brother Thomas of Worcester, and his son, Sir Henry Percy, "Harry Hotspur," had been heretofore the most powerful friends of Henry Bolingbroke. But being related to Lionel's heirs, Sir Edmund Mortimer, Hotspur's brother-in-law, and the young earl of March, they demanded the release of the latter, and the ransoming of the former, who had fallen into Welsh captivity. Henry IV. disregarded both requests. Thereupon the Percies allied themselves with Douglas and the captured Scots, and marched to the aid of the Welsh. They were overtaken and defeated by Henry at Shrewsbury, 1403. Harry Percy fell in the battle. His uncle Thomas was beheaded; his father, the earl of Northumberland, was first imprisoned, then released and finally fell in a later northern rising against Henry. In 1405 a new insurrection broke out in Yorkshire in favor of Edmund, earl of March. Among others the well-beloved Archbishop Scrope who had always maintained that the crown did not belong to Henry, was captured, sentenced to death by a tool of Henry's, and executed against all law and precedent.

85. Scotland. — David II., after a long and inglorious reign, died childless in 1370. Robert Stuart, son of the high steward and of Margery, daughter of Robert Bruce, succeeded to the throne as Robert II. He was succeeded in 1390 by his eldest son Robert III. Mild, upright, and deeply religious, Robert with his virtuous queen Annabella Drummond, recalled to his people the days of David I. and Matilda. In proportion to the waning danger of foreign invasion, the turbulence of the barons increased. Much of the power of the king, who had been lamed in his youth, passed into the hands of his brother, Robert, duke of Albany, who not only allowed full rein to the nobles, but foully murdered David, duke of Rothesay, the king's eldest son. Alarmed for the safety of his only surviving son James, Robert III. sent him to France to be educated at the court of that kingdom. But Henry IV., to secure himself against Scotland, sent out his cruisers and captured the prince, in spite of the truce existing between the two countries, and carried him to London, where he received, however, a thorough education. The loss of his sons broke the father's heart; he died in 1406. Albany, now regent, made not the slightest protest against this violation of international right.

Henry IV. ended his troublesome reign in 1413 in one of his epileptic fits which secret remorse and public anxieties seem to have brought on the Lancastrian usurper.

86. First Years of Henry V. (1413–1422.). — Henry V. exchanged the wild pranks and boisterous amusements of his youth for the career of a chaste, pious, energetic and chivalrous ruler. In war

he was severe, even pitiless as long as his object was at stake, but kind and generous as soon as it was gained. He had his first encounter with Sir John Oldcastle, one of the gay companions of his youth. Blinded by religious fanaticism John organized a Lollard rising which aimed at the overthrow of the king for the purpose of transforming England into a socialistic commonwealth with Oldcastle for its protector. This Lollard rising was speedily suppressed by the king in person, and the ringleaders were taken and executed. Sir John was tried for heresy and burnt in 1417 in conformity with a law passed by Parliament in 1401. Next he had to suppress a conspiracy of the earl of Cambridge to set aside the House of Lancaster. Earl Richard had married Anne, the sister of the childless earl of March, whom Henry V. had restored to liberty. Anne was thus the prospective heiress of Lionel, and through her Cambridge hoped to secure the succession for his son Richard, afterwards duke of York. Cambridge and two of his accomplices were executed. The heir of Cambridge was brought up in the household of Henry V. No other political execution occurred in the reign of Henry V., whose domestic rule, marked by uncommon prudence and moderation, together with his great success in France, made him one of the most popular kings of England.

87. How the Lionel claim passed to the House of York.


Edward III.
Lionel, Duke of Clarence.
Edmund, Duke of York, d. 1402.
Philippa, m. Edmund Mortimer, Earl of March.
Roger Mortimer, Earl of March.
Edmund, Earl of March.
ANNE m. RICHARD, EARL OF CAMBRIDGE, executed 1415.
Edward, Duke of York. (Richard's elder brother.)
RICHARD, DUKE OF YORK.

88. **Burgundians and Armagnacs.** — Under Charles VI., 1380–1422, English influence declined still more, both in France and Flanders, when Philip van Arteveld, Jacob's son, was defeated and slain at Roosebeke by the young king of France (1382). A truce concluded in 1389 and repeatedly renewed between France and England, gave the country an interval of peace, during which Charles VI. was overtaken by the misfortune of his life, intermittent insanity (1392). The king's authority passed into the hands of his unscrupulous brother, Louis, duke of Orleans, who was favored by Isabella of Bavaria, the faithless wife of the afflicted king, and opposed by the duke of Burgundy, Philip the Bold, and his son John the Fearless. The Burgundian party had its strength in Paris and the northern cities. In 1407 Orleans was murdered by a Parisian mob at the instigation of John the Fearless. At once civil war broke out between the Burgundian party supported by the towns and the Orleanist party supported by the feudal nobility. The count of Armagnac, the father-in-law of the young duke of Orleans, assumed the leadership of the nobles. Great excesses and cruelties were committed by both parties. Armagnac finally succeeded in gaining possession of Paris and of the king, and declared the duke of Burgundy an enemy of the realm.

89. Agincourt, 1415. — Whilst France was thus distracted by a civil war, Henry V. revived the claims of Edward III. and the war with France, which he deemed necessary to maintain the popularity of the House of Lancaster. His ambassadors demanded that the Peace of Bretigny should be carried out, and that Catharine, the daughter of Charles VI., should be given him in marriage with the dowry of Normandy, Maine and Anjou. Upon the rejection of the bold demand, Henry crossed the channel with 30,000 men, landed at Harfleur near the mouth of the Seine, and captured the city after a six weeks' siege in which the English made for the first time effective use of cannon. Hence he intended to march to Calais, but finding the bridges of the Somme destroyed, had to ascend almost to its source. With his remaining 10,000 men he made a stand at Agincourt (Azincourt) against the French feudal army, numbering 60,000, and, employing the tactics of Crécy, won a brilliant victory. Its lustre, however, was obscured by a cruel deed; mistaking some French plunderers in his rear for a fresh army, Henry ordered a vast number of prisoners to be slain as a matter of safety. Among the English fell the duke of York. The French lost over 6,000, chiefly of gentle blood. Among the many surviving prisoners were the dukes of Orleans and Bourbon. From Agincourt the victor accom-

plished his march to Calais. The day of Agincourt brought to Henry an enthusiastic reception in England, and complete security from any further conspiracies.

90. **The Fall of Armagnac.** — The loss of Agincourt fell chiefly on the Armagnacs, but they were still strong enough to keep possession of Paris and the king. The king's youngest son, Charles, had meanwhile become dauphin by the death of his two brothers. He was with the Armagnacs firmly opposed to the Burgundian party. In view of the despotic rule of Armagnac, John the Fearless once more declared himself the head of the popular party, concluded peace and alliance with queen Isabel at Troyes, and proclaimed her regent in 1417. Meanwhile France was being reduced to the utmost misery. Unlicensed marauders of all degrees imitated the excesses of the companies of adventurers who composed the regular armies. Whole tracts of France were changed into deserts uncultivated and fallow, covered with bush and brushwood. Even in the capital wolves roamed at large, so that three or four were sometimes killed in a single night. In 1418 conspirators opened one of the gates of Paris to the Burgundians and the city was taken. The citizens again rose, and first imprisoned, then massacred the count of Armagnac and 2,000 of his adherents. The dauphin succeeded in escaping unhurt from Paris.

91. The Peace of Troyes, 1420. — During this civil strife Henry V. had again descended upon the Norman coast. After taking Caen he conquered Normandy, starved Rouen into submission, and marched to the very walls of Paris. The French were compelled to negotiate, but no party could afford to grant his terms which comprised the cession of over two-thirds of France; accordingly the parties resolved to unite against the common foe. But in a personal interview between the dauphin and the duke of Burgundy, on the bridge of Montereau, the latter while kneeling before the dauphin was struck down by the battle-axe of an ardent partisan of the Armagnacs, and slain on the spot. Queen Isabel, Philip the Good of Burgundy, the son of the murdered duke, and the city of Paris now threw hesitation to the winds and granted all the demands of Henry V. By the Treaty of Troyes ratified by Charles VI. and the States-General, Henry received the princess Catharine in marriage, and was acknowledged as the regent and heir of France during the lifetime, and as king after the death of Charles VI. Henry promised to respect the laws, customs and class privileges of France,

to reunite all the conquered provinces with the kingdom, and to maintain under the union of the crowns a perpetual separation of the kingdoms. Towards the end of the year 1420 Henry entered Paris in triumph.

92. **Death of Henry V. and Charles VI., 1422.** — A third time Henry returned to France to avenge the defeat and death of his brother, the duke of Clarence, at Baugé. He drove the Armagnacs to the Loire but was unable to take Orleans. At Vincennes he fell ill and died, at the age of forty-two. "He had been," so an enemy, Juvenal des Ursins, the historian of Charles VI., wrote of him, "of high and great courage, valiant in arms, prudent, sage, great in justice, who without respect of persons did right as readily for small as for great; he was feared and revered of all his relations, subjects and neighbors." He died regretting that he had not lived to achieve the conquest of Jerusalem. His great qualities as leader and ruler, however, would have availed him little in France, had not her rival factions hated each other far more bitterly than they hated Henry. Charles VI "the well-beloved," died two months after Henry V. "In his days," says his biographer, "he was pitiful, gentle and benign to his people, serving and loving God, a great giver of alms." The southern provinces of France, which for centuries had opposed the Capetian House, clung firmly to the dauphin and made themselves the real representatives of the national feeling. The greatest misfortune which had ever befallen France, helped to weld the north and south into one kingdom.

Lingard: *Henry IV., Hist. of England*, vol. 4, ch. 4; *Henry V.*, vol. 5, ch. 1. — Green: *The House of Lancaster*, Book 4, ch. 5. — Gardiner: *Henry IV. and Henry V.*, vol. 1, pp. 289–306. — James Gardiner: *The Houses of Lancaster and York* (Epochs). — A. Strickland: *Joanna of Navarre.* — Lord Brougham: *Hist. of England and France under the House of Lancaster.* — J. H. Wylie: *Hist. of England under Henry IV.* — Edw. Barrington de Fonblanque: *Annals of the House of Percy.* — *The House of Percy:* Q. R., '89, 1, p. 393. — Kitchin: *Charles VI., 1380–1422*, vol. 1, pp. 486–512; *The Hundred Years' War, 3d period, 1415–1422*, pp. 513–529. — Vallet de Viriville: *Isabeau de Baviére.* — Boutaric: *Institutions Militaires de la France avant les armées permanentes.* — *The Hundred Years' War, Charles VI. and the Dukes of Burgundy:* Guizot: *Pop. Hist. of France*, ch. 23. — Monstrelet: *Chronicles* (Johne's Translation), Bk. 1. — E. de Bonnechose: *Hist. of France.* — Church: *Henry V.* — J. E. Tyler: *Henry of Monmouth.* — G. M. Towle: *Hist. of Henry V.* — M. T. Allies: *The Church and the House of Lancaster*, vol. 1, pp. 300–322. — M. Noble: *Historical Genealogy of the House of Stuart.*

§ 7.

THE MAID OF ORLEANS. FOURTH AND LAST PERIOD OF THE HUNDRED YEARS' WAR.

93. **Accession of the Child-King, Henry VI.** — The infant son of Henry V. was acknowledged without opposition in England, where a regency of

lords and commoners managed the government. The duke of Gloucester, Henry V.'s youngest brother, acted as the guardian and representative of the king. To put an end to the interference of Scotland in France, the regency fulfilled the promise made by Henry V. to restore James I., the poet-king of Scotland, to his realm, after an unjust confinement of more than twenty years. In France where the duke of Bedford, Gloucester's elder brother, was regent, the claims of Henry VI. were recognized in the north and in the east. The dauphin, "the king of Bourges," as he was contemptuously called, held the lands south of the Loire, and claimed hereditary royalty over all France, but found himself almost without authority, resources and followers.

94. The Relief of Orleans and the Coronation of Charles VII. — The war of sieges and skirmishes carried on for some years under Bedford in France was favorable to the English, until one of the most wonderful occurrences in history gave an unexpected turn to the whole situation. In the month of March, 1429, Jeanne d'Arc (Joan of Arc), a saintly peasant girl of Domremy in the duchy of Bar presented herself before the dauphin at Chinon in Touraine, declaring that she had a divine commission, communicated to her by St. Michael, St. Catharine and St. Margaret, to relieve Orleans and to conduct the dauphin to Rheims to be crowned after the manner of his ancestors. Pronounced irreproachable by a committee of learned divines and magistrates, at whose hands she underwent a most rigorous examination during six weeks, she was at last admitted to the royal presence, at once identified the king who had mingled in disguise among the courtiers, and revealed to him a secret known only to himself. She was given charge of a small army of relief from which she banished all loose characters. Every soldier received the sacraments. Army and people were animated with a new hope and spirit. A consecrated banner and a sword were the symbols of her authority; for she shed no blood with her own hands. The sword was unearthed by her direction from a great depth behind the altar of St. Catharine of Fierbois. With her little army full of religious enthusiasm she first led a convoy of provisions into Orleans in full sight of the English besiegers, who looked on as if spell-bound. Next she attacked the enemy with such impetuosity that within eight days the English army was completely routed or in full retreat. From Orleans she started for Rheims. Her march

through the enemy's country, dotted with strongly fortified and garrisoned cities, resembled a triumphal progress. Among the numerous cities, which declared for the dauphin, Beauvais expelled its unworthy bishop Cauchon, a furious adherent of the English-Burgundian faction. Rheims itself opened its gates and its Archbishop solemnly crowned Charles VII. with the crown of France, Jeanne standing and bidding him receive it from the hand of God and wear it as his vassal. The fame of the Maid of Orleans spread throughout Christendom, 1429.

95. Martyrdom and Rehabilitation. — After achieving the most important part of her mission, Jeanne d'Arc moved toward Paris. St. Denis opened its gates. But when she led the troops to the attack of Paris the king ordered her back and sent the army into winter quarters. The king's slothfulness and the ascendency of courtiers and soldiers who were jealous of the heroine's fame henceforth paralyzed her operations. In May, 1430, one of the prophecies revealed to her "that she would last one year" was fulfilled. In a great sortie from Compiegne she was cut off and captured by the Burgundian besiegers, and subsequently sold to the regent Bedford for 10,000 francs of gold. The French king and his crew of favorites abandoned her to her fate. The English government instituted proceedings against her. The infamous Cauchon, England's paid agent, was the first mover in the iniquitous trial. The University of Paris, demoralized by its schismatical revolt against the Papacy, and an ally of England and Burgundy, supported the cause by its authority. In December, 1430, Jeanne d'Arc was taken to Rouen to be tried for witchcraft and heresy, imprisoned in irons and treated with the utmost brutality. Her bearing and her replies were worthy of one acting under supernatural guidance; but her condemnation was a foregone conclusion. Her repeated appeals to the Holy See were simply disregarded. She was burnt in May, 1431, in the market place of Rouen, now decorated with her statue. At the stake she behaved with heroic simplicity. With the last cry, "Jesus," she passed away crowned with the threefold halo of heroism, sanctity and martyrdom.

Before the crowd surrounding the stake had dispersed, a party of English nobles were heard to exclaim: "We have done for ourselves; we have delivered a Saint to the flames." And so it came to pass. All her prophecies about the complete expulsion of the English were fulfilled. In 1453 Charles VII., who had treated her so ill during her lifetime, made her tardy amends by ordering a trial of rehabilitation. Five years later Pope Calixtus III. named a commission to conduct the process. The result was the entire reversal of the English trial, and the complete vindication of the innocence of the Maid of Orleans. The sentence of rehabilitation was prom-

ulgated at Rouen, with great solemnity and public rejoicing. The process of her beatification is now in progress.

96. Termination of the Hundred Years' War. — The English cause was indeed irretrievably lost. Bedford gave up all hope of saving the English possessions in France, when he saw that the duke of Burgundy, after the death of his wife, Bedford's sister, became tired of the English alliance. Bedford's own death and the reconciliation of Charles VII. and Philip the Good happened the same year, 1435. Paris was recovered by the French king, 1436. The marriage of Henry VI. with Margaret of Anjou, daughter of René, count of Provence, and titular king of Jerusalem and Anjou, brought about a truce with France and the cession of Anjou and Maine to Charles VII., 1445. The breach of the truce by an English vessel in 1449 furnished a pretext to the French of attacking the provinces still in the hands of the English. Fortress after fortress was taken. Rouen fell in 1450, and with Rouen all Normandy. Guienne and Gascony were lost in 1453. Thus all the English possessions in France were swept away except the strongly fortified city of Calais, which soon became a basis of operations for banished nobles in the bloody Wars of the Roses. The war ended without a formal conclusion of peace.

Kitchin: *The Hundred Years' War*, 4th (and 5th) period: *The Age of Jeanne d'Arc*, vol. 1, pp. 530–571. — G. Masson: *Mediaeval France*, and other General Histories of France. — Adams: *Growth of the French Nation: The Hundred Years' War*, pp. 108–135. — Lord Brougham: *Hist. of England and France under the House of Lancaster*. — Gardiner: *Henry VI. and the Loss of France*, vol. 1, pp. 307–318. — Monstrelet: *Chronicles*, Book 2. — V. de Viriville: *Histoire de Charles VII. et de son Epoque*. — Marquis de Beaucourt: *Histoire de Charles VII.: Chas. VII. of France*, E. R. '83, 2, p. 170. — A. Thomas: *Les Etats Provenciaux de la France sous Charles VII.* — Boucher de Molandon–A. de Beaucoups: *L'armée Anglaise vaincue par Jeanne d'Arc sous les murs d'Orleans*. — Mgr. Ricard: *Jeanne d'Arc la vénérable*. — F. M. Wyndham: *The Maid of Orleans*. — Lady Amabel Kerr: *Joan of Arc* (C. T. S. T.). — Mrs. Oliphant: *Jeanne d'Arc, Her Life and Death*. — R. Parsons: *Joan of Arc, Studies*, vol. 3, p. 54. — Lord Stanhope: *Jeanne d'Arc*, see Q. R. '42, 1. — Harriet Parr: *The Life and Death of Jeanne d'Arc*. — Wallon: *Jeanne d'Arc*. — Also: Q. R. '95, 1, p. 461; H. P. B., v. 51, p. 369. — Duhr: *Jeanne d'Arc im Urtheile der neuen Geschichtsschreibung*. — J. B. J. Ayroles, S. J.: *La Vraie Jeanne D'Arc; La Pucelle devant l'Eglise de son temps*. — Belon et Balme, O. P.: *Jean Bréhal, Grand Inquiesteur de France, et la Réhabilitation de Jeanne d'Arc*. — Guicherat: *Procés de condemnation et de réhabilitation de Jeanne d'Arc*. — Lanéry d'Arc-Grellet Balgerie: *La Pinzel à d'Orlhienx*. — Lucien Jeny et Pierre Lanéry d'Arc: *Jeanne d'Arc en Berry*. — P. Lanéry D'Arc: *Mémoires et Consultations en faveur de Jeanne d'Arc*.

§ 8.

HENRY VI. THE WAR OF THE ROSES.

97. The Uncles of Henry VI.

Henry IV.

HENRY V.	*Thomas*, Duke of *Clarence*,	*John*, Duke of *Bedford*,	*Humphry*, Duke of *Gloucester*.
HENRY VI.	fell in France, 1421.	Regent in France, d. 1435.	Protector. d. 1447.

98. Jack Cade's Rebellion. — During the king's minority, his uncle Humphry, duke of Gloucester, made himself the mischief-maker in England, by his petty quarrels with Bedford, and his opposition to the statesmanship of Cardinal Beaufort. The Cardinal conscientiously supported the peace policy which the young king had adopted from principles of religion. Gradually, however, the influence of William de la Pole, earl and later duke of Suffolk, who arranged the king's marriage with Margaret of Anjou and mediated the French truce, became paramount. The Cardinal withdrew from court into his diocese of Winchester, where he died, not in despair as Shakespeare represents it, but a saintly death in 1447. As head of the peace party, Suffolk enjoyed the favor of both the king and the queen, and the hearty ill-will of Gloucester, the head of the war party. In 1447 Gloucester was arrested on the charge of conspiracy against the king, and a few days later was found dead in his lodgings. Whether he died a natural death or was murdered, has never been ascertained. The loss of Rouen and Normandy in 1450 was laid to the charge of Suffolk, and roused a strong national resentment against him. Impeached by the House of Commons of having aspired to the crown and betrayed England to France — a mere tissue of falsehoods — Suffolk was sent to the Tower. To save him from a worse fate, Henry banished him for four years; but he had scarcely embarked when he was murdered by Kentish sailors. The real author or authors of the murder remained unknown. Suffolk's assassination was at once followed by a rising in Kent, the stronghold of the national discontent. The insurrection was led by Jack Cade, an Irishman, who gave himself out as a Mortimer, a kinsman to Richard, duke of York. The king, deserted by his army, retreated to Kenilworth, while Jack Cade entered London, but was driven out by the citizens and slain whilst hiding in Sussex. The name assumed by Jack Cade and the fact that Richard of York was kept away from court as lord lieutenant of Ireland make it probable that Richard himself caused Suffolk's murder and the rising of Cade, in order to test the strength of his party and his chances of winning the crown of England, which he claimed as Lionel's heir through his mother Anne. (See no. 87.)

99. The Two Branches of the Lancastrian House.


Lancaster Branch.
1. Blanche of Lancaster.
JOHN OF GAUNT married:
2. Constance of Castile.
Beaufort Branch.
3. Catherine Swynford.
Henry IV.
Catherine.
John of Beaufort. Earl of Somerset.
Cardinal Henry Beaufort.
Henry V.
John Beaufort, Duke of Somerset.
Edmund Beaufort, Duke of Somerset, slain at St. Albans.
Joan m. James I. of Scotland.
Henry VI.
Edward, Prince of Wales, slain at Tewkesbury.
Margaret Beaufort.
Henry Beaufort, Duke of Somerset, beheaded at Hexham.
Edmund Beaufort, Duke of Somerset, beheaded at Tewkesbury.
Margaret Beaufort.

100. Beginning of the Wars of the Roses, 1455–1458. Battle of St. Albans, 1455. — In this dangerous situation the king's council recalled Edmund Beaufort, duke of Somerset, from Normandy. Somerset was, since the Cardinal's death, the chief representative of John of Gaunt's family on the Beaufort side, and the mainstay of the Lancastrian House. At the same time, Richard, duke of York, left Ireland without asking leave, landed with a small army in England, and gathered around him a party of lords and commoners for the purpose of supplanting Somerset in his influential position. But finding that he was too weak to overthrow Somerset, he yielded to the advice of his friends, dismissed his army, and took an oath of allegiance at St. Paul's as a guarantee for his future loyalty, 1452. In 1454, the king was prostrated by a severe illness which affected his mind, and the duke of York was chosen regent or protector in the House of Lords. Somerset was sent to the Tower, 1454. The birth in the same year of Edward, prince of Wales, destroyed Richard of York's hope for a peaceful succession, and induced the queen to step forward as the head of the royal party.

Margaret of Anjou was Henry's strength and weakness; his strength in her indomitable will and faithful, heroic defense of his rights; his weakness because the nation had been prejudiced against her by Gloucester and the war party, as the representative of the only possible but bitterly unpopular policy of peace with France.

When the king recovered in 1455, Somerset was restored. Thereupon Richard of York, supported by the two Nevilles, father and son, Richard, earl of Salisbury, and Richard, earl of Warwick, rose in

rebellion, defeated the king's forces at St. Albans, and slew Somerset. Richard of York, now master in England, appointed Warwick governor of Calais. Thus began the civil strife between the Houses of Lancaster and York, which lasted thirty years and is known as the Wars of the Roses, because a red rose was the badge of the House of Lancaster, a white rose that of the House of York.

A general pacification at St. Paul's, 1458, brought about by the generous efforts of Henry VI. was of short duration. The party of York again rose in 1459. Richard of Salisbury was victorious at Blore Heath. But too exhausted to make a further stand against the unremitting energy of the king, the party abandoned the contest for a time. York with his second son, the earl of Rutland, fled to Ireland; his eldest son, Edward, earl of March, and the two Nevilles to Calais. Nobles and clergy swore allegiance anew to the king and the prince of Wales.

101. The Victory of the White Rose. — In 1460 the three earls of March, Salisbury and Warwick landed in Kent, and after entering London marched with 60,000 men to Northampton, where they defeated the Lancastrian nobles with great slaughter. The king became the prisoner of the Yorkists, and was taken to London. The queen fled with the prince to Scotland. The duke of York, returning from Ireland, regardless of his many oaths and the mercy which had been invariably extended to him by Henry VI., now formally claimed the crown as the heir of Edward III., through his mother Anne, the heiress of Lionel. Through the mediation of Archbishop Bourchier of Canterbury, a descendant of Thomas of Gloucester, a compromise was adopted by the House of Lords by which Henry was to reign for life and to be succeeded by the duke. Richard now went to meet the queen who, meanwhile, had collected an army in the north. At Wakefield the Yorkists were routed. Richard of York fell in the battle, his son Rutland was stabbed by Clifford, whose father had been slain by York, and the earl of Salisbury was subsequently beheaded by the Yorkshire men at Pomfret, 1461. Soon after the earl of March, now Edward, duke of York, won the battle of Mortimer's Cross over the Lancastrians, while the queen won the second battle of St. Albans over Warwick and delivered the king from captivity. The victorious Edward and the defeated Warwick hastened to London, where Edward was pro-

claimed king by the Yorkist nobles, the time-serving clergy and the London traders, 1461. Edward quickly followed the retreating Lancastrians to the north and defeated Henry and Margaret in the battle of Towton — the bloodiest since Senlac — with terrible loss on both sides. Henry VI. and his family fled into Scotland. The Parliament of the same year recognized Edward's title and passed a bill of attainder and forfeiture againt the House of Lancaster and its partisans. Edward was crowned at Westminster by the Primate Bourchier, June 29.

Lingard: *Henry VI.*, vol. 5, ch. 2. — Green: *The House of Lancaster*, Book 4, ch. 5; *The Monarchy; The House of York*, Book 5, ch. 1. — Gardiner: *The Later Years of Henry VI.*, v. 1, pp. 320–328. — Stubbs: *To Henry VI.*, vol. 3, pp. 69–193. — A. Strickland: *Margaret of Anjou.* — George Kriehn: *The English Rising in 1450.* — Gairdner: *Lancaster and York.* — Ramsay: *Lancaster and York.* — Thomson: *Wars of York and Lancaster.* — Cyril Ramsone: *The Battle of Towton*: E. H. R., v. 4, p. 460.

§ 9.

HOUSE OF YORK. EDWARD IV. AND RICHARD III.

102. Restoration of the Red Rose. — Many years passed before Edward IV. was firmly seated on the throne. Towton had not ended the war. Margaret reappeared in the north, and it took two years till her forces were defeated at Hexham (1464) and king Henry himself was taken and lodged in the Tower. Meanwhile Edward married Lady Grey, better known by her maiden name, Elizabeth Woodville. The lavish distribution of lands and dignities among the Woodvilles offended Warwick and other Yorkist nobles. The earl was dismissed from the king's council. Political dissension increased the breach. Warwick desired an alliance with France where the astute Louis XI. had succeeded his father Charles VII., in 1461. Edward allied himself with Burgundy where Charles the Bold had succeeded Philip the Good in 1467. To strengthen himself at home, Warwick intrigued with George, duke of Clarence, gave him his daughter in marriage, and awakened in him the hope to supplant his brother Edward on the throne of England. In proportion as the king became a voluptuary and a tyrant, he lost the confidence of the people. It was an easy task for Warwick to stir up an insurrection in the north, but in 1470 his forces were routed by Edward's artillery at Stamford. Declared traitors, Warwick and Clarence fled to France.

Louis XI. succeeded in mediating a reconciliation between Margaret of Anjou and Warwick — hitherto the greatest foes — based on Warwick's oath to restore the throne to her husband and the succession to her son. The reconciliation was a blow to the ambition

of Clarence, who, for the present, however, disguised his resentment. When Warwick in 1470 landed in England, Edward IV., deserted by his forces, fled to Charles the Bold, duke of Burgundy. Once more Henry VI. came forth from the Tower to reascend the throne of England. Warwick, "the king-maker," was meanwhile the most powerful man in England.

103. Fall of the Red Rose. — In 1471 Edward IV. landed in Yorkshire "to claim his duchy." At Northampton he proclaimed himself king. When he approached the capital, Clarence, — "false, fleeting, perjured Clarence" — threw off his mask and joined his brother. London, whose merchant population liked Edward on account of his alliance with Burgundy, the great wool market of England, opened its gates. With the captive Henry VI. in his train, Edward met Warwick at Barnet and totally defeated him. The king-maker was slain in the battle or in the rout that followed. The same day queen Margaret landed with a French army at Weymouth, but hearing of Warwick's fall, marched to the north. At Tewkesbury the Lancastrians were routed with great slaughter.

Edward IV. now gave full vent to his lust for revenge. After the battle young Edward the Lancastrian prince was first insulted by Edward and then brutally murdered by his brothers Clarence and Gloucester. It was probably the first murder in which Richard, duke of Gloucester, king Edward's youngest brother, took an active part. Somerset and a considerable number of nobles, who had taken sanctuary, were beheaded two days after receiving Edward's sworn pardon. The Lancastrians had religiously respected the sanctuary of Edward's wife, children, and 2,000 of his partisans during his exile. Henry VI. by the king's desire was murdered in the Tower by Richard of Gloucester. Margaret taken prisoner at Tewkesbury was ransomed by her father, and returned to France, 1475.

"Henry VI. was perhaps the most unfortunate king who ever reigned. He saw all who loved him perish for his sake. He was most innocent of all the evils that befell England because of him. Pious, pure, generous, patient, simple, true and just, humble, merciful, fastidiously conscientious, modest and temperate, — he divided his time between the transaction of business and the reading of history and Scripture. The common people revered him like a saint, and retained down to the Reformation the prayers of the king who had perished for the sins of his fathers and of the nation." (Stubbs.)

104. Edward's Rule (1461–1483). — The history of the following years is a record of the cruelties and exactions of Edward IV. "The rich were hanged

by the purse, the poor by the neck." Parliament became a mere name; the Lords died on the battle-fields and the Commons were ignored. The bills of attainder and the confiscations enabled the king to dispense with parliamentary grants. Deficits were supplemented by "benevolences," *free* gifts which none of the large landowners dared to refuse. Thus equipped he undertook a blustering invasion of France, relying on the help of Charles of Burgundy. But Charles was busy in Germany, and Louis XI.'s policy completely duped and outwitted the English king, and sent him home with a pension, 1475. After his return new dissensions broke out in the royal family. Clarence and Gloucester were jealous of each other and the Woodvilles. The king's suspicions of Clarence were revived when the latter sued for the hand of Mary, the Burgundian heiress. Edward personally impeached his brother of treason. Condemned by the Lords he was conveyed to the Tower, and drowned, it is said, in a butt of malmsey. Ruined by debauchery and despised by the European courts, Edward died in 1483, leaving two boys, Edward, aged twelve, now king of England, and the eleven-year-old Richard, duke of York.

105. Gloucester's Usurpation.— The dying king had appointed Richard, duke of Gloucester, guardian of the boy-king and protector of the realm. As soon as the Woodvilles heard of the king's demise they hastened to London with Edward V., but were overtaken by the duke of Gloucester and his cousin Henry, duke of Buckingham. Their principal men, earl Rivers and Sir Richard Grey, were sent as prisoners to Pomfret Castle and soon after beheaded without a trial. Gloucester took charge of the young king and with the consent of the council, conveyed him to the Tower. The queen took sanctuary at Westminster. Lord Hastings, the leading member of the council, when trying to defend the queen against Gloucester's stupid charge of witchcraft, was dragged out of the council chamber and murdered on the spot. Gloucester next got the little duke of York into his hands, and lodged him with his brother in the Tower. He then denied the validity of Edward IV.'s marriage with Elizabeth Woodville, and in his downward course of infamy attacked the honor of his own mother by branding his elder brothers as bastards and declaring himself the only legitimate heir to the crown of England. Amidst the silence of the London citizens his own and Buckingham's servants proclaimed him king, an obsequious Parliament declared him to be the lawful heir, and Cardinal Bourchier conferred on Richard III. the coronation which had been prepared for Edward V. The

two royal boys in the Tower were smothered in their beds by hired assassins and buried at the foot of a staircase.

106. Richard Falls at Bosworth, 1485 — Union of the Roses.—A few months after the coronation Buckingham, who had tried to save the princes, was in open rebellion against Richard, allied with the Woodvilles, the Lancastrians and a number of disgusted Yorkists. The plan, approved by Thomas Morton, bishop of Ely, one of the greatest statesmen of the time, was to marry Henry of Richmond, the only surviving representative of John of Gaunt on the Beaufort side to Elizabeth of York, the daughter of Edward IV. Richmond then living in exile in Brittany was to land and Buckingham to raise an army in Wales. But Richmond's fleet was driven back by a storm, and Buckingham, cut off from Wales, was betrayed to the king and beheaded at Salisbury, 1483. In 1485, however, Henry of Richmond landed in Wales and, reinforced by accessions from different sides, met Richard III. at Bosworth. A part of Richard's army went over to Henry, another part stood aloof from the fight, and Richard with the cry of "treason, treason!" threw himself into the thick of the battle, the blood-stained crown on his head, and fell beneath the blows of the avengers. Richmond picked up the crown of Richard from the battle-field, and Cardinal Bourchier set it on the head of the victor. With Henry VII. the House of Tudor mounted the throne of England. His marriage with Elizabeth of York united the Red and the White Roses.

Lingard: *Edward IV., Edward V., Richard III.*, vol. 5, chap. 3-5. — Green: *The Monarchy; the House of York*, Book 5, ch. 1. — Gardiner: *The Yorkist Kings*, vol. 1, pp. 329-343. — Stubbs: vol. 3, pp. 200-294; *Parliamentary Antiquities*, ch. 20. — Mary T. Allies: *Wars of the Roses: Cause and Result*, vol. 1, p. 323. — A. Strickland: *Elizabeth Woodville, Queen of Edward IV.; Anne of Warwick, Queen of Richard III.* — Gairdner: *Lancaster and York.* — Ramsay: (Wars of). — Habbington: *Reign of Edward IV.* — Hall: *Chronicles: The Union of the Two Families of Lancaster and York* (from Henry IV. to Henry VIII.). — Hollinshed: *Chronicles.* — James Gairdner: *Life and Reign of Richard III.* — Oman: *Warwick the King-maker.* — A. R. Markham: *Richard III.* (attempted defense), E. H. R., v. 6, p. 250. — James Gairdner: *Did Henry VII. Murder the Princes?* (Answer to Markham), E. H. R., v. 6, p. 444.

LANCASTER, YORK, AND TUDOR.



CHAPTER III.

CONSOLIDATION OF THE EUROPEAN MONARCHIES.

§ 1

FOUNDATION OF THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE.

107. The House of Anjou in Naples and Hungary.

CHARLES I., of Anjou,
King of Naples, died 1285.

CHARLES II., the Lame,
K. of Naples, 1285–1309,
m. Mary, sister of
Ladislas IV. of Hungary.

Isabella
m. Ladislas IV. K. of Hungary.

Charles Martel (d. 1301),
rival King of Hungary
against Andrew II.
(d. 1301), the last Arpad.

ROBERT,
King of Naples,
1309–1343.

John.

Louis.

CHARLES I.,
King of Hungary,
d. 1342.

Charles,
d. 1328.

CHARLES III.,
since 1385 King of
Naples, d. 1386.

JOANNA I.,
d. 1382.
married and
murdered
Andrew, the brother
of *Louis the Great.*

LOUIS THE GREAT,
K. of Hungary and
Poland, d. 1382.

LADISLAS,
d. 1414.

JOANNA II.,
d. 1435.

MARY, Queen of Hungary,
m. **SIGISMUND.**

Hedwig, Queen of Poland,
m. **JAGELLO,** Duke of Lithuania,
as King of Poland, **WLADISLAW II.**

WLADISLAW III.,
King of Poland and Hungary, etc.

108. Hungary. — The House of Arpad, which had ruled Hungary since the great Magyar invasion of the tenth century (vol. I., No. 250, 251) died out in 1301, and the crown of St. Stephen passed over to the Neapolitan Anjous who had intermarried with the descendants of Arpad. Charles Martel, who disputed the throne with Andrew III., the last male heir of Arpad, was the first of the line. The vigorous government of Charles I., 1308–1342, and his foreign alliance with Austria, Bohemia, Luxemburg, and France, made Hungary a great European power. His son and successor, Louis the Great, 1342–1382, first undertook two punitive expeditions into Naples to avenge the foul murder of his brother Andrew, the unfortunate husband of the wicked Joanna I., of Naples. Next he conquered Zara and the whole of Dalmatia, thus undoing the work of Venetian aggrandizement, to which Dandolo had sacrificed the success of the Fourth Crusade (vol. I., No. 525). By the acquisition of Dalmatia, by his feudal supremacy over Servia, Bulgaria, Wallachia and Moldavia, and, finally, by his succession in Poland as the nephew and heir of Casimir, the last Piast king of Poland, Louis the Great became the most powerful monarch of Europe. The prestige of Hungary, diminished under Sigismund and Albert II. of Austria, was revived by Mathias Corvinus, the son of the Transilvanian hero Hunyadi, whom the Hungarians raised to the throne by a national election. His victories over the Turks, the Bohemians and the Emperor Frederick III., were accompanied by solid improvements in every branch of the administration, the establishment of a standing army, and the enlightened encouragement which he accorded to science and art. Thus Hungary became for a time the strong bulwark of Christendom by land against the advance of the Ottoman Turks.

109. Poland. — The long line of the Piasts in Poland came to an end with Casimir III., whose just administration, introduction of a legal code, encouragement of learning and munificence in founding churches, schools and hospitals, earned him the title of the Great. At his death in 1370 the succession passed over to his sister's son, Louis the Great of Hungary, and from him to his daughter Hedwig. The two enemies with whom the Poles had frequently to contend, were their heathen kinsmen, the Lithuanians, and their

Christian neighbors, the Teutonic knights of Prussia. With the first power peace was established by the marriage of Queen Hedwig with Jagello, duke of Lithuania (1376), who received baptism, assumed the name of Wladislas II. (1386–1434), established Christianity among his people, and united Lithuania and part of Russia with Poland. With the Teutonic knights he engaged in a series of wars, and for a time broke their power by the splendid victory at Tannenberg, 1410. His son, Wladislaw III. (1434–1444) was also elected king of Hungary, but fell in the battle of Varna (No. 113). Thereupon the knights who had sadly degenerated from the spirit of their vocation, renewed their aggressions in Poland whilst they tyrannized over their own subjects. Accordingly a confederation of nobles, clergy and cities rose and appealed to Casimir IV., the third Jagellon, for protection. A twelve years' sanguinary war ensued, which ended with the Peace of Thorn, 1466. The Order had to cede western Prussia with Marienburg to Poland, and to hold eastern Prussia with the new seat of the Order at Koenigsberg as a Polish fief. Thus the great Christian kingdom of Poland under the strong dynasty of the Jagellons (1386–1572) reached its largest extent from the Black Sea to the Baltic.

110. The Ottoman Turks. —The Ottoman Turks (Osmanlis) received their name from Othman (Osman), their first aggressive leader, who in 1299 invaded the territory of Nicomedia. Gradually they conquered the Christian and Mohammedan countries of western Asia and made piratical raids on the European coasts. Orkhan, Othman's son, began to organize a new fighting force, a body of infantry called the Janissaries or new soldiers. Children were carried off from Christian parents and brought up as Moslems. The strongest and bravest boys were drilled in arms, and became the most effective troops of the Osmanlis. What with other tyrants had been an occasional outrage became under the Ottomans a standing custom. By his warfare with the Palaeologi Orkhan obtained a firm footing in the Greek Empire. In 1361 Sultan Amurath I. stormed Adrianople and made it the first Ottoman capital and the first Mohammedan shrine in Europe. More and more the Greek Empire was confined to Constantinople and its surrounding territories, whilst the Turks spreading northward through Servia and

Bulgaria came in contact with Hungary, which soon became the perpetual theater of Turkish victories and defeats.

111. Bajazet I. Ilderim or the Lightning. — Since 1389 Bajazet I. astonished the world by the rapidity of his passages between Europe and Asia. The distress of the threatened Christian nations induced Boniface IX. to proclaim a Crusade against the Turks. Sigismund, then king of Hungary, gathered an army of 100,000 men, among them the flower of the Hungarian, German and French nobility. But in the fatal battle of Nicopolis, 1396, the majority of the Crusaders were slain or driven into the Danube. A portion of the French chivalry were made prisoners. Bajazet spared twenty-five of the highest rank for their ransom. The rest were offered the choice of the Koran or the sword. One by one they stepped forward, professed their faith and were beheaded in the Sultan's presence.

112. Tamerlane. — Bajazet in his career of triumph had sworn to feed his horses from St. Peter's altar in Rome, but he was overthrown by a conqueror mightier than himself, Timour or Tamerlane, a descendant of Jenghis Khan. With his Mongols or Turcomans he penetrated far into Russia and devastated the countries on the Caspian and Black Seas. As a Shiah he hated the Sunnites as fiercely as the Christians. Pyramids of skulls marked the direction of his marches. When he destroyed Bagdad he raised a mound of 90,000 skulls. In 1402 Tamerlane met Bajazet at Angora in Asia Minor. Bajazet was defeated and captured in the battle, and for the last nine months of his life, it is said, was carried about by Tamerlane in an iron cage on his march through Asia. After Tamerlane's death, 1405, his vast Mongolian empire broke into pieces.

113. Amurath II. — Under Amurath II. the Ottoman Turks again became aggressive, besieging Constantinople in the south, and overrunning the Slavonian country and Lower Hungary in the north. Eugene IV. proclaimed a new Crusade and levied a tithe on church property and a fifth on his own revenues. The high-minded Cesarini, the Cardinal-legate of Eugene, filled the Hungarians with enthusiasm for the cause of Christendom. Hunyadi, duke of Tran-

silvania, who had repeatedly defeated the Turks with great slaughter, drew volunteers to his standard from all the nations of the West, penetrated far into Servia and routed the Turks at Nisch. The Sultan sued for peace. Contrary to the advice of Pope Eugene and Cesarini the Hungarians accepted the offer, 1443. Next year the prospects of a combined attack upon the Turks by Venice and the Greeks led Cesarini to urge Hungary again to war. But the Venetian fleet failed to appear at the appointed time; the Turks were enabled to cross the Hellespont and the Christians suffered a crushing defeat at Varna, 1444. King Wladislaw III. of Hungary and Poland and Cardinal Cesarini found a noble death on the battlefield. In the two days' battle at Kossowa, 1448, the Christians under Hunyadi were once more defeated by overwhelming odds. 17,000 Hungarians and 40,000 Turks remained on the field.

114. The Fall of Constantinople, 1453. — Under Mahomet II.) the Conqueror, Amurath's son, the Ottoman Turks accomplished the conquest of Constantinople. Whilst Mahomet was engaged in an Asiatic expedition the Greeks broke a ransom-treaty just concluded with him. Mahomet at once made peace in Asia and began to build a powerful fortress on the Bosporus above Constantinople, which gave him full command of the Black Sea, 1451. While the terrified Greeks clamored for help in the West, the people at home rose against the ratification of the Union effected by their own prelates at Florence, and loudly proclaimed that they would rather have the Turban in Constantinople than the Tiara. On May 29, 1453, the city was stormed, and the Crescent henceforward replaced the Cross on the Hagia Sophia.

It was due to the bravery of Constantine Palaeologus, the last Emperor, and to the valor of the Latins present, that the city of Constantinople held out so long. The Greek inhabitants of Constantinople acted in the most cowardly way. The Emperor and a small number of his followers fell whilst fighting on the walls. The Sultan made no demands on the Greeks to turn Moslem, but at once gave his protection to the opponents of the Union. He claimed the right of appointing and investing the Patriarch. Henceforth the Sultans exercised and maintained all the rights which the Byzantine Emperors had exercised over the schismatical Church. The Patriarchs had to purchase their offices and received their investiture from the head of the

Moslem world. The Greek Church under Mohammedan rule sank to the lowest degradation of which a Christian Church is capable.

Pastor-Antrobus: *Advance of the Turks and Fall of Constantinople*, vol. 2, pp. 240–289. — R. Parsons: *The Pontificate of Nicholas V.*, Studies, vol. 3, p. 140. — Creighton: *Nicholas V. and the Fall of Constantinople*, vol. 2, pp. 308–327. — Kayser: *P. Nikolaus V. und das Vordringen der Türken*: H. P. B., v. 6, p. 208. — Sir E. G. Creasy: *Hist. of the Ottoman Turks.* — E. A. Freeman: *The Ottoman Power in Europe: History and Conquests of the Saracens* (Lecture 6). — Lamartine: *Hist. of Turkey.* — Finlay: *Hist. of the Byzantine and Greek Empire* (to 1453). — Sir J. E. Tennent: *Hist. of Modern Greece.* — Malcolm: *The Hist. of Persia.* — A. Vambéry: *Hist. of Bokhara.* — W. Coxe: *Hist. of the House of Austria*, vol. 1. — McLeod: *The Magyars, the Angevin and Elective Monarchies*, M. '79, 3, p. 46. — E. Szabad: *Hungary, Past and Present.* — J. A. Dunham: *Hist. of Poland.* — L. Ranke: *Hist. of Servia.* — Sir R. Comyn: *Hist. of Western Europe*, vol. 2. — Hammer: *Gesch. des osmanischen Reiches* (10 vols.). — J. W. Zinkeisen: *Gesch. d. osm. Reiches in Europa.* — Hammer-Purgstall: *Geschichte der Mongolen in Persien.* — A. D. Mordtman: *Belagerung und Eroberung Konstantinopels.* — G. F. Herzberg: *Geschichte Griechenlands, 1204–1470; Gesch. der Byzantiner und des osmanischen Reiches bis zu Ende des XVI. Jahrhunderts.* — Arndt: *Russland und Constantinopel im 15 Jahrh.*: St., v. 45, p. 58, 130. — W. Miller: *Bosnia before the Turkish Conquest*: E. H. R., v. 13, p. 643. — J. Caro: *Gesch. Polens.* — F. Palacky: *Geschichte Böhmens.* — J. Mailath: *Gesch. der Magyaren.*

§ 2.

THE DEFENSE OF EUROPE.

115. **Apathy of Western Princes.** — Europe stood aghast when the news arrived that Mahomet had made himself master of Constantinople. It was a heavy blow to Nicholas V. who had sent twenty-nine galleys to aid Constantinople. In this dire calamity the Pope alone was true to his position. He issued a summons for a Crusade and dedicated all the revenues of the Holy See to its service. His successor, the Spanish Pope Calixtus III., was filled with the enthusiasm of a Spanish Crusader; his one great thought was to stay the advance of the Turks and to reconquer Constantinople. His legates went to France, England, Germany, and Hungary. The papal fleet of twenty-five sail with 1,000 sailors, 5,000 soldiers and 300 cannon under Cardinal Scarampo, joined by a few galleys from Naples, strengthened and provisioned Rhodes, drove the Turks from Lemnos, Samothrake and Thasos; but in the absence of reinforcements these resources were too small to accomplish great results. The apathy and selfishness of the princes rendered united action impossible. While the Pope sold the treasures of art collected by Nicholas V. and even his own table service for the benefit of the Crusade, the king of Naples spent the crusading moneys in his pleasures or on private wars; Charles VII. prohibited the export of the collected sums from France, and sent the fleet equipped by the French Church against England and Naples; the Emperor Frederick III. sat idly at home planting his garden and catching birds; the German princes talked in their diets and intrigued against each other and against the Pope; Christian of Denmark and Norway stole the crusading money from the sacristy of the cathedral of Roskilde.

116. The Relief of Belgrade, 1456. — Meanwhile in 1456 Mahomet II. was approaching to the siege of Belgrade with 150,000 men. John Hunyadi hastened to Belgrade with all his available troops. Cardinal Carvajal, the papal legate, who for six years shared the hardships of the crusading army on the Danube, gathered forces and provisions for Hunyadi. The humble friar, St. John Capistrano, brought Crusaders from Languedoc, Germany and Poland. Capistrano on account of his sanctity and inspired eloquence was an army in himself. With 200 small boats Hunyadi in a bloody battle of five hours' duration broke through the powerful fleet of the Turks, whose ships were chained together. The combined attacks of the Turkish forces on Belgrade were heroically repelled and finally turned into a complete rout of the enemy. The whole Turkish camp and part of the artillery fell into the hands of the Crusaders.

Hunyadi and St. Capistrano died soon after the battle. The apathy of Europe neglected to utilize this victory of Belgrade. Dissensions among the Hungarians after the death of Hunyadi frustrated a contemplated new Crusade. Matthias Hunyadi Corvinus, the son of the hero of Belgrade, chosen king of Hungary the following year, continued the defense of Hungary.

117. **Skanderbeg.** — After the death of Hunyadi only one Christian hero remained in the field who was a match for the Turks, George Kastriota, prince of Albania, "the Athlete of Christ." Born of Slavonic parents he was brought up in the mountains of Albania. That in his youth he was a captive or hostage of the Turks or a favorite of Mahomet, is disproved by original documents, but he received from the Turks the surname of "Skanderbeg," or Bey Alexander, in recognition of his prowess. In 1444 he secured the independence of Albania against the followers of the Prophet. For a quarter of a century he baffled the overwhelming forces of the Ottoman Empire. He fought battle after battle with the Crescent, was but once defeated and never conquered. Venice with her miserable policy of commercial greed and her shameful treaties of peace and amity with the infidel, more than once fomented risings in Albania against the hero who was only assisted effectively by Calixtus III. and Alfonso of Naples.

In 1450 Mahomet II. besieged Croya, the chief stronghold of Albania, with 160,000 men, but was repulsed with terrible slaughter by the invincible Skanderbeg. Between 1452 and 1461 a number of smaller forces and five great Turkish armies melted away

before the vigorous onslaught of this hero. In 1456 he won his greatest victory at Tamorniza; 30,000 were slain, 1,500 captured, and the whole camp taken by the small army of Christians. Two sieges of Croya, in 1466 and 1467, conducted by Mahomet II. at the head of 200,000 men, were complete failures — Mahomet had to draw off with an estimated loss of from 60,000 to 70,000 men. Skanderbeg died in 1468 of marsh-fever in the twenty-fifth year of his noble championship of freedom and Christianity. If Skanderbeg only temporarily averted the fate of his country, he permanently secured the safety of Italy. Mahomet's cherished design of repeating the exploit of Constantinople in Rome was rendered abortive at the foot of the Albanian hills.

118. Efforts of Pius II. for a Crusade. — Meanwhile the Turks subdued Servia, 1458, Morea, 1460, the Empire of Trebizond, 1461, Bosnia and Slavonia, 1463. At the Congress of Mantua Pius II. invited the princes to a new Crusade. But his broad policy of European interest was swallowed up by a policy of small and selfish expediency. He finally succeeded in gaining the co-operation of Hungary, Venice and Milan. Skanderbeg was to be the commander-in-chief, the Pope the spiritual head of the Crusade. But on his arrival at Ancona to join with his galleys the stately fleet of Venice, Pius II. died, and left his war-treasure to Matthias Corvinus, of Hungary, and his galleys to Venice. The doge sailed back to Venice and the Crusade of Pius II. was at an end.

"It must always be an honor to the Papacy," says Creighton, "that in a great crisis of European affairs it asserted the importance of a policy which was for the benefit of Europe as a whole. Calixt III. and his successors deserve, as statesmen, credit which can be given to no other of the politicians of the age. The Papacy by summoning Christendom to defend the ancient limits of Christian civilization against the assaults of heathenism was worthily discharging the chief secular duty of its office." Paul II. and Sixtus IV. continued to send subsidies to Albania and Hungary and to build galleys for crusading purposes. The Turkish army which stormed Otranto and massacred its inhabitants in 1480, was driven back across the Adriatic with the aid of Sixtus IV. Dissensions among the Turks under the unwarlike successors of Mahomet II. gave a respite to the western nations. Under Innocent VIII. and Alexander VI. nothing was to be expected from the Popes. The tortuous and self-interested policy of the Italian states and the

worldliness and corruption of an evil age had taken hold of the very court of Rome.

Pastor-Antrobus: *Calixtus III., the Champion of Christendom ag. the Turks*, v. 2, pp. 341–388; *The Holy See and the Eastern Question*, pp. 389–428; *Scanderbeg*, pp. 429 foll.; *Pius II.*, vol. 3, p. 3, etc.; *The Eastern Question and the Congress of Mantua*, pp. 45–100; *The Eastern Question, 1460–63*, pp. 240–268; *Crusade and Death of Pius II.*, pp. 311–374. — Creighton: *Calixtus III.*, vol. 2, p. 345; *Pius II.*, p. 365; *His Crusade and Death*, pp. 456–500; *Paul II.*, vol. 3, pp. 3–33. — R. Parsons: *Studies: Calixtus III.*, vol. 3, p. 150; *Paul II.*, p. 173. — G. Voigt: *Enea Silvio de Piccolomini, als. P. Pius II. und sein Zeitalter.* — Dr. v. Heinemann: *Aeneas Sylvius (Pius II.), als. Prediger eines allgemeinen Kreuzzuges.* — Camille Paganel: *Hist. de Scanderbeg, ou Turcs et Chrétiens au XV. siècle.* — *Albania and Scanderbeg*: E. R.'81, 2, p. 325. — Traknói: *Mathias Corvinus.* — W. H. Allies: *Three Cath. Reformers of the 15th Century: John Capistran.* — Bain: *The Siege of Belgrade, 1456:* E. H. R., v. 7, p. 235. — J. A. Fessler: *Geschichte Ungarns.* — Jos. v. Hammer: *Geschichte des osmanischen Reiches*, and the other works mentioned under § 1.

§ 3.

SWITZERLAND, BURGUNDY AND FRANCE.

119. League of the Swiss Cantons. — The mountain population of the three original cantons of Switzerland, Schwyz, Uri and Unterwalden, were, since the thirteenth century, ruled by the counts of Hapsburg as landgraves. These cantons, after the death of Rudolf of Hapsburg, established a perpetual league to reduce the power of the landgraves as much as possible. In 1309 Henry of Luxemburg granted them a long-desired charter which placed them in immediate dependence on the Empire, like free cities. The Oath on the Rütli, the story of Tell and Gessler, etc., are legends first found in chronicles written between two and three hundred years after the pretended time of their occurrence, and in many points contradicted by contemporary documents. The Swiss Confederacy was originally a separatist league, like the Franconian, Suabian and Rhenish city-leagues, a loose union of ecclesiastical princes, patrician cities and mountain villages. In 1215 the Swiss Confederates defeated the flower of the Austrian chivalry, led by Leopold of Austria, in the battle of Morgarten. The original league was gradually joined by the other mountain districts or cantons. In the wars between the nobles and the cities which disturbed king Wenzel's reign, a later Leopold of Austria attacked the Confederacy, but lost battle and life at Sempach, 1386. In a Swiss civil war (1440–46) Zürich allied itself with Austria, and was besieged by the victorious Confederates. At the request of Frederic III., Charles VII. of France sent the Armagnac companies, for whom he had no further employment, into Switzerland to raise the siege of Zürich. The Confederates were defeated at St. Jacob's. But the final victory of the Swiss over Frederic's forces at Ragaz, 1446, established their practical independence. Owing to the weakness of the Empire the cantons became free republics. The independence of the Swiss Confederacy was formally recognized in the Peace of Westphalia (1648).

120. Louis XI. of France, 1461–1483. — Meanwhile France was fast approaching the final consolidation of monarchical power. Charles VII., relieved from the pressure of the Hundred Years' War, established a permanent tax to be levied by the king with the co-operation of the States, and organized the first standing army in place of free companies. His successor Louis XI. destroyed the power of the great barons, held the clergy in the bonds of Gallicanism, so lucrative to his treasury, laid the foundations for an absolute monarchy, and inaugurated the French policy of foreign acquisitions. Before his accession to the throne most of the great fiefs of Capetian France had been annexed to the crown. The dukes of Burgundy, Brittany, Bourbon, Berri and other princes and barons organized an armed conspiracy, the so-called League of the Public Weal. To win popular support, they demanded, in addition to their own territorial aggrandizement, administrative reforms, a reduction of the taxes, and the convocation of the States General. The league defeated the king's forces at Montlehery, 1465, and besieged him at Paris. Wholly destitute of warlike courage, the king yielded to the demands of the princes in the Treaty of Conflans. But by fomenting jealousies and quarrels among the allies, and by dealing with the chief men individually, he broke up the league. When the States General met at Tours in 1468, Louis gained a complete ascendency over its members. They took away from the princes nearly all the concessions of Conflans. Having done the king's work, they were dissolved never to be recalled again during his reign.

Unimposing in appearance, parsimonious in private life, slovenly in dress, fond of the company of his barber and hangman, this most astute of the politicians of his time secured a reality of power without its show, as no king before him had ever wielded.

121. **Louis XI. and Charles the Bold of Burgundy.** — Burgundy had grown to be one of the strongest states in Europe. King John the Good had given Burgundy to his youngest son Philip the Bold, who by his marriage with the heiress of Flanders laid the foundation for the power of his House in the Netherlands. Under his son John the Fearless and his grandson Philip the Good the power of Burgundy reached its summit. Philip obtained Holland, and acquired new territory in return for his recognition of Charles VII. Philip's son Charles the Bold inherited their accumulated possessions. As *duke* of Burgundy and count of Flanders and Artois, he

was the vassal of France. As duke of Brabant, *count* of Burgundy and lord of many other territories, he was the vassal of the Empire. But he was as powerful as his liege lords. The possession of the great cities of the Low Countries, the first of Europe in industry and commerce, made the Burgundian duke the richest European prince. Personally Charles the Bold, or the Rash, was a man of purity and culture, but proud, wrathful and obstinate. Whilst Charles was carrying on a feud with the city of Liège, Louis XI. was at war with Brittany. In his anxiety to pacify the duke, hitherto an ally of Brittany, the king paid him a personal visit at Peronne. During his stay a ferocious revolt broke out at Liège, which was unmistakably traced to the intrigues of the royal visitor. Charles, in a blaze of anger, seized the person of his king and dictated his own terms to his prisoner. Louis had to confirm the territorial cessions made to the duke in the Treaty of Conflans, and to witness the ruthless destruction of Liège. The peace was of short duration. In an assembly of notables Louis repudiated the Treaty of Peronne. Once more Charles tried to form a coalition, and invaded France with fire and sword. But the allies were either bought or imprisoned or executed by Louis, and Charles had to conclude a truce with the king.

122. The Fall of Charles the Bold. — Having failed to shake by feudal coalitions the daily growing power of Louis XI., Charles turned his attention to the work of consolidating his scattered dominions, and to establish a power on the Rhine equivalent to old Burgundy and Lorraine. The acquisition of Gelderland by bequest gave him the mouths of the great river. The seizure of Lorraine after the death of its duke, the occupation of Alsace and the siege of Neuss, a fortress which dominated Koeln, were intended to secure the middle Rhine. Louis XI. meanwhile without openly appearing in the field, raised up enemies against Charles on every side. Baffled at Neuss, Charles marched upon Lorraine and Switzerland, took Nancy from the former, 1475, and Granson from the latter, 1476. But the Swiss poured down from their mountains, routed his army and captured his camp and treasures at Granson, and reinforced by the men of Lorraine, Alsace and Austrian Germany (Breisgau), inflicted a second crushing defeat on Charles the Bold. Retreating upon Nancy with the remnants of his army he found it in the hands of the young duke, and lost his last battle and his life, 1477, under the walls of the city which he had marked out for his future capital. Louis XI. seized the duchy and even the "Free County" (Franche Comté) of Burgundy, which the dukes held of the

Empire. But Mary, the daughter of Charles the Bold, the greatest heiress of Christendom, gave her hand to archduke Maximilian, the Emperor's son, who succeeded in saving the whole inheritance, with the exception of the Burgundian duchy, to their son Philip the Fair, archduke of Austria. By conveying her own possessions to Maximilian, Mary laid the foundations of the greatness of the House of Hapsburg, but also of the great rivalry between Austria and France.

123. House of Hapsburg.

RUDOLF OF HAPSBURG, 1273–1291.

ALBRECHT I., 1298–1308, assassinated.....by.....John Parricida.

Rudolf m. Agnes of Bohemia.

FREDERIC THE FAIR, 1314–1330.

Albrecht II. of Austria.

Albrecht III. of Austria.

Albrecht IV. of Austria.

ALBRECHT II., 1438–1439. (Albrecht V. of Austria.)

Leopold the Pious.

FREDERIC III., 1440–1493. Last **EMPEROR** crowned in Rome.

MAXIMILIAN I., 1493–1519....m....**MARY OF BURGUNDY.** **"EMPEROR ELECT."**

Philip the Fair, Archduke of Austria.

After the three brilliant victories over Charles the Bold the Swiss were considered the best infantry in Europe, and their alliance being eagerly sought by the different powers, they began to take part in general European affairs.

124. Final Consolidation of France.— A few years after the acquisition of the Burgundian duchy, Louis XI. received Provence, Maine, Anjou and the titular claim to the kingdom of Naples by bequest. His son and successor Charles VIII. completed the work

of consolidation by marrying Anne, the heiress of Brittany, thus bringing the last feudal province of France into the circle of crown-domains.

"The better side of Louis XI.'s character shone forth in his unwearied industry, exactitude and justice bordering on severity, in all things pertaining to law and finance. He was liberal towards churches and cloisters and also in founding and endowing hospitals. He favored the universities, especially that of Paris, and founded that of Bourges (1465). He allowed the press to be set up in the Sorbonne, the chief college of Paris, where many books were forthwith printed, and established the first postal service in France. Anxious to promote good government among his people, an enemy of the feudal lords and a friend and protector of the middle classes, he nevertheless became the originator of the absolute royal power, and that system of centralization, which henceforth clung to every form of government in France.

J. Heywood: *The Establishment of Swiss Freedom and the Scandinavian Origin of the Legend of Tell.*— O. Delepierre: *Historical Difficulties.* — W. D. McCracken: *The Rise of the Swiss Republic.* — D. Lardner: *Hist. of Switzerland.* — Albert Rilliet: *Les Origines de la Confédération Suisse; Histoire et Légende.* — Hug-Stead: *The Story of Switzerland.* (St. of N. S.).— E. R., '69, 1, p. 127: *The Legend of Tell and Rütli.* — Dr. K. Dändliker: *Gesch. der Schweiz* (vol. 1, to Tell).— *Memoirs of Philipe de Comines* (to Louis XI., Charles the Bold). — E. de Monstrelet: *Chronicles* (transl. by Johnes). — D. Considine: *Louis XI.* M. '75, 2, p. 129. — P. F. Willert: *The Reign of Louis XI.* — Urbain Legeay: *Hist. de Louis XI.* — *Histories of France*, by Kitchin; Wright; Crowe; Guizot (ch. 26, Pop. Hist.). — G. Picot: *Hist. des États Généraux* (1355–1614). — E. A. Freeman: *Charles the Bold: Hist. Essays*, vol. 1, No. 11. — J. F. Kirk: *Hist. of Charles the Bold, Duke of Burgundy.* — E. R. '64, 1, *Charles the Bold.* — C. Rausch: *Die burgundische Heirat Max. I.* — L. S. Costello. *Memoirs of Mary of Burgundy.* — Baron Kervyn de Lettenhove: *Hist. de Flandre.* — J. E. Thorold Rogers: *The Story of Holland* (St. of N. S.). — N. G. van Kampen: *Gesch. der Niederlande.* — A. Bachman: *Deutsche Reichsgeschichte im Zeitalter Friedrichs III. and Max. I.*— J. Chmel: *Gesch. Friedrich's III. and Maximilian, I.* — Prutz: *Staatengeschichte des Abendlandes bis Maximilian I.*

§ 4.

THE KINGDOMS OF THE IBERIAN PENINSULA.

125. Portugal. — Since the end of the eleventh century Portugal had steadily succeeded in strengthening her separate existence and her independence of the larger Spanish kingdoms. Alfonso III. (1245–1279) finished the conquest of the Moorish Algarve, the southernmost part of Portugal. His son Diniz (1279–1325), the husband of St. Elizabeth of Portugal, gave the first impulse to Portuguese navigation, discovery and foreign conquest by creating a fleet and making Lisbon an emporium of transmarine trade, whilst

St. Elizabeth acted as successful peacemaker between the kings of the Iberian peninsula. Diniz, one of the greatest rulers in any period, was the real founder of Portugal's greatness. His son, Alfonso IV. (1325–57), allied with Alfonso XI. of Castile, frustrated the last attempt of the Moors to reconquer Spain in a great battle on the river Salado, 1340, where 58,000 Christian warriors defeated 460,000 Moors; 200,000 of the enemy remained dead on the battlefield. John I., the Great (1385–1433), began to carry the war against the Moors into their African homes, and conquered Ceuta, whence Tarik had invaded Spain in 711. Still greater were the achievements of his son, the Infante Dom Henry the Navigator, who in a career of splendid enterprise discovered and annexed to Portugal Porto Santo, Madeira with its sugar and wine plantations, the Canaries, Cape Verde with its islands, and the coast of Sierra Leone. (d. 1460). Alfonso V. (1448–1481), "the African," added the conquest of Tangiers to Ceuta, and uniting them founded the "Christian kingdom of Algarve beyond the sea." Eugene IV. and Nicolas V. confirmed Portugal in the possession of these conquests and discoveries, obliging the kings to introduce Christianity in these new acquisitions. Portugal reached the zenith of its power and its golden age under Emmanuel the Great, 1495–1521. Under him Bartholomew Diaz discovered the Cape of Good Hope, 1486, and Vasco da Gama in 1497–98 doubled the cape and found the ocean passage to East India. The results of these voyages were a series of rich discoveries along the eastern coast of Africa, the Persian gulf and the shores of India and the peninsulas and islands beyond, the diversion of the eastern trade from Alexandria and Venice to the Atlantic seaboard by the longer but easier way around the Cape of Good Hope, and the foundation of a great Indo-Portuguese Empire with its capital at Goa. Throughout the sixteenth century Portugal was of all European nations the leading power in Asia. In 1500 Alvarez Cabral gave Emmanuel another great empire in the west by the discovery of Brazil. Emmanuel I. was a perfect Christian ruler, his court a model school of religion, purity and high-minded chivalry, his policy that of a deep and enlightened interest in the conversion of his heathen subjects in Asia, Africa and America.

126. The House of Trastamare in Castile and Aragon.


Alfonso X., the Wise, of Castile, 1225 | 1284
Sancho IV., 1284–1295.
Ferdinand IV., 1295–1312.
Alfonso XI., 1312–1350.
Castile.
Aragon.
Pedro the Cruel, 1350–1369.
Henry II. of Trastamare, 1369–1379.
John I. of Castile, 1379 | 1390.
Ferdinand I. of Aragon, 1412 | 1416.
Henry III., 1390 | 1406.
Alfonso V. of Aragon and Naples, 1416–1458.
John II. of Aragon, 1458 | 1479.
John II., 1406 | 1454.
Henry IV., 1454–1474.
Alfonso, Rival King. d. 1468.
ISABELLA THE CATHOLIC, 1474–1504.
FERDINAND THE CATHOLIC, 1479–1516.

The feuds of the Trastamare family, like the Wars of the Roses, thinned the ranks of the turbulent nobles and enabled the crown of Castile to strengthen itself with the help of the Commons. Under Henry III. the Commons were in a prosperous state. Since John II. however, the right of town-representation was confined to sixteen towns.

127. The Union of Castile and Aragon. — A mighty change was brought about in the Spanish peninsula by the marriage of the virtuous and high-minded Isabella, heiress of Castile, with Ferdinand the Infante at Aragon, 1469. The male line of the House of Trastamare having died out with Henry IV. in 1474, the Assembly of States at Segovia proclaimed Isabella queen of Castile with sovereign power. Whatever authority Ferdinand would exercise in Castile was to be derived from her. At the death of John II. of Aragon, the kingdom with its dependencies descended on Ferdinand. By the union of the crowns of Castile and Aragon the foundations were laid for the magnificent Empire which was destined soon to overshadow every other European monarchy.

To put an end to the anarchy inherited from former reigns, Isabella restored the influence of the Commons, and revived the "Holy Hermandad" or Brotherhood, an association of the towns for the repression of violence. The head of every hundred families had to bear the expenses for the equipment and horsing of a man-at-arms. This measure, combined with the severe impartiality in Isabella's personal administration of justice, restored social order and public safety and established the supremacy of the law. Isabella and Ferdinand encouraged the popular branch of the Cortes in every way and extended the representation. The men whom Isabella presented to the Pope for ecclesiastical dignities were churchmen of exemplary piety and learning. The Castilian court became a nursery of virtue and generous ambition.

"As the Spanish kingdom gained coherence, and could look forward to the day when the Moors would be driven out of the land, the old fervor of the crusading spirit grew strong among the people This renewed sentiment created a national jealousy against the numerous Jews, some of whom had (outwardly) embraced Christianity, and who as a class had a greater sympathy with the Moslem than with the Christians. To protect the Christian faith and to maintain the purity of the Spanish blood, Ferdinand and Isabella applied in 1473 for the Pope's authority to appoint inquisitors for the suppression of heresy throughout their realm. Permission was granted but the real work of the Spanish Inquisition was not begun til 1483 by Thomas of Torquemada whom Sixtus IV. empowered to constitute the Holy Office. This institution, however, did not proceed from Rome, but was of native growth. It is unfair to brand Sixtus IV. as a persecutor because as head of the Church he granted to princes the power which they considered necessary for the maintenance of the faith within their dominions." (Creighton.)

128. The Conquest of Granada, 1481–1491. — The invasion of Castile and the capture of Zahara by the Moors in 1481 revived the spirit of mutual hostility which had slumbered for a long time. Ferdinand and Isabella made great preparations for the war, which lasted ten years and was opened by the capture of the important city of Alhama, only eight leagues distant from Granada. After a failure in the siege of Loya, Cordova was made the chief basis of operation, whence the Crusaders made annual incursions in spring and harvest time, usually led by Ferdinand himself, while Isabella provided ample supplies for the army. In the course of this war Isabella's artillery, unwieldy though it was, became the first in Europe. Violent dynastic divisions in the royal family of Granada greatly aided the Christians, now thoroughly united and enthusiastically cooperating with the sovereigns. Isabella was the soul of the enterprise. Her fame attracted volunteers from France, Germany,

Switzerland and England. The charm of her personality filled all with courage and perseverance, whilst her commanding influence transformed the camp into a vast Christian community from which every loose character as well as all gambling was strictly excluded. Loya fell in 1486. By 1487 seven large cities and eighty-four smaller places were in the hands of the Christians. The capture of Malaga, 1487, cut off Granada from the sea and inclosed the Moslem capital within a circle of Christian possessions. The extremely strong fortress of Baza capitulated in 1488, and with it the richest part of the kingdom. The actual campaign against Granada opened 1491. 1,030 towers protected the Moorish capital. Here Gonsalvo de Cordova, afterwards called the Great Captain, first acquired distinction. The defense was carried on with great vigor, but the hearts of the Moslem sank within them, when they saw the city of Santa Fé rise before their walls under the superintendence of Isabella. The capitulation was signed by Boabdil, the last Moorish king in Spain, Nov. 25, 1491. The banner of the cross planted by Cardinal Mendoza on the heights of the Alhambra, announced to the Christians, that the rule of the Crescent in Spain had come to an end. Ferdinand and Isabella entered the capital in triumph January, 1492.

Thus ended a warfare of seven and a half centuries. The news of the fall of Granada was received with joy throughout Europe, and considered as counterbalancing in a measure the loss of Constantinople. Granada fell to Castile. All the kingdoms of Spain, except Portugal and the small kingdom of Navarre in the north, were now united under Ferdinand and Isabella, on whom the Pope conferred the title of "Catholic Sovereigns." Immediately after the conquest of Granada, Spain inaugurated a period of discoveries, and entered the wider field of European politics.

129. Discovery of the New World, 1492. A few months after the conquest, Isabella, acting in her own right and for the kingdom of Castile, signed the contract with the Genoese mariner, Christophero Columbo, which led to the discovery of the New World. From the moment when Columbus had been convinced of a higher calling, "to spread the knowledge of God and the light of faith to many nations," he had toiled through eighteen years of weary waiting, hoping against hope, to find the means of carrying out his unalterable resolution.

August 3, 1492, Columbus set out from Palos with three caravels to seek a western passage to India. In the night of Oct.

11–12 he was the first to see the moving light which was a conclusive proof of the presence of land. At two o'clock in the morning the New World was sighted. Planting the standard of the Crucifix, Columbus solemnly took possession of the island of Guanahani in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ for the crown of Castile under the name of San Salvador. Pursuing his course in a southwestern direction, he struck the Greater Antilles, Cuba and Haiti, with their luxurious vegetation and strange inhabitants, 1492. On his second voyage, 1493–96, he added the Lesser Antilles, Puerto Rico, and Jamaica to his discoveries. In his third voyage, 1498–1500, he took a more southerly course and passing between the island of Trinidad and the mainland of South America, discovered the mouth of the Orinoco, indicating the presence of a vast hinterland. His last voyage, 1502–1504, led to the shores of Central America, the Bay of Honduras and the Isthmus of Panama, and proved the impossibility of a western passage to India.

From his third voyage in which, according to his own report, he seems to have recognized the existence of a large continent which was not Asia, he returned to Spain in irons, superseded and betrayed, charged by his malevolent and treacherous rivals of crimes, which *they* had committed and *he* had done his best to prevent. Columbus will always remain the hero of one of the greatest human achievements. In him the ardor of the explorer was elevated by the power of religious zeal. The thought uppermost in his mind in all his trials and hardships was the conversion of the Indians.

The gold which he sought in the New World was not intended for his enrichment or that of his family, but for the conquest of the Holy Land and the support of the Holy See, in case a new schism should threaten the Church. The ingratitude and malice with which he was treated, remains a blot on the history of Ferdinand and Spain.

130. Arbitration of Alexander VI. – To remove all cause of dispute with Portugal, the Spanish sovereigns after the first return of Columbus had at once recourse to Alexander VI. to determine the respective rights of Spain and Portugal. The Pope established a line of demarcation running from the North to the South Pole at a distance of 100 leagues west of a point lying half way between the Azores and Cape Verdi Islands. All discoveries running southward, which would be made to the west of this line, were to belong

to Spain, those east of this line to Portugal. When the Portuguese complained that they had not enough sea-room for their voyages, east and south, Spain of her own accord moved the line 270 miles further west (1494), thus unwittingly ceding Brazil, discovered in 1500, to Portugal.

Prescott: *Hist. of the Reign of Ferdinand and Isabella.* — P. B. Gams: *Die Kirchengeschichte von Spanien; Das Reich Aragon, 1248–1479*, vol. 3, p. 1, pp. 260–316; *Portugal, 1245–1500*, pp. 317–351; *Castilien, 1248–1492*, pp. 352–446. — R. Baumstark: *Isabella von Castilien und Ferdinand von Aragon;* see also Bauer: St. v. 9, p. 335. — C. M. Yonge: *The Story of the Christians and Moors in Spain.* — Kayser: *Nikolaus V. and die Maurenkämpfe der Spanier und Portugiesen;* H. P.-B., vol. 8, p. 609. — R. H. Mayor: *Life of Prince Henry of Portugal, surn. the Navigator.* — *Prince Henry the Navigator:* E. R. '68, 2, p. 200. — C. R. Beazley: *Prince Henry the Navigator and the Age of Discovery* (*Heroes of the Nations*). — G. Correa: *The Three Voyages of Vasco da Gama* (Hakluyt Soc., 1869). — G. M. Towle: *Voyages and Adventures of Vasco da Gama.* — *Vasco da Gama:* M., vol. 12, p. 176 (O. S.). — C. R. Markham: *The Sea Fathers.* — E. M. Clerke: *Toscanelli and Vespucci:* D. R. '99, 1, p. 60. — J. Yeats: *Growth and Vicissitudes of Commerce.* — Knight, S. J.: *Ch. Columbus.* — De Lorgnes: *Christophe Colomb.* — F. H. Allen: *Columbus and the Discovery of America.* — Tarducci-Brownson: *The Life of Ch. Columbus.* — Arthur Helps: *The Life of Columbus.* — W. Irving: *Columbus; Voyages and Discoveries of the Companions of Columbus.* — J. Winsor: *Christopher Columbus.* — *Columbus:* M., vol. 9, pp. 168, 257, 389; vol. 11, pp. 29, 137. — H. K. Bancroft: *History of the Pacific States.* — J. Fiske: *The Discovery of America.* — R. Southey: *Hist. of Brazil.* — E. G. Bourne: *The Demarcation Line of Pope Alexander VI.* (Yale Rev., May, 1892).

§ 5.

HENRY VII. OF ENGLAND.

131. Yorkist Risings. — Henry VII. began his reign with the restoration of attainted Lancastrians, whilst he passed an act of attainder against Richard III. and those who had fought for him at Bosworth. This measure was, however, soon after mitigated by a general pardon to all who swore fealty within forty days. His chief opponent was Margaret of Burgundy, the sister of Richard III. and widow of Charles the Bold, living in the Low Countries. In the absence of a true Yorkist, she induced Lambert Simnel, son of a joiner in Oxford, to personate the earl of Warwick (Clarence's son), whom Henry VII. kept safely in the Tower. Simnel was crowned in Ireland, defeated at Stoke, in England, and made successively a turnspit and falconer in Henry's household (1487). Perkin Warbeck, the son of a boatman in Tournay, was another false pretender, encouraged not only by Margaret of Burgundy, but by the chief European courts. He styled himself Richard Plantagenet, duke of York, pretending to be one of the princes murdered in the Tower. Henry surrounded him with spies, whose reports from the Continent sent a number of English nobles to the block. Unsuccessful in Kent, Ireland, Scotland, Warbeck landed, 1494, in Cornwall, where only a few months before a rising against heavy taxation had been suppressed, and marched with

7,000 men to Taunton. Here his courage completely failed him. He deserted his followers, and being captured, confessed his imposture, and was sent to the Tower. It was after the senseless rising of a third pretender, Ralph Wilford, that Warbeck was purposely placed in communication with the real earl of Warwick. When the two plotted an escape, both were executed upon a trumped-up charge of treasonable conspiracy. The last fears of a Yorkist rising were caused by the discontent of the duke of Suffolk, a nephew of Edward IV., who twice fled to the Continent, to get up an army of invasion. He was surrendered by archduke Philip of Austria, now king of Castile, and kept a prisoner in the Tower. He was executed in the beginning of the next reign.

132. Henry's Foreign Policy. — Henry VII. was the most pacific king of the period, wary and watchful, who gained more by crafty diplomacy than he would have gained by the sword. Even his desultory warfare was rather a means of filling his coffers than of making any conquest. Thus, a quarrel with France about Brittany gave him an opportunity of levying subsidies and benevolences at home, and of accepting 149,000*l.* from the French king for withdrawing from his territory. He managed not only to keep peace with Maximilian I. and his son Philip the Fair, archduke of Austria, whom he knew to be supporters of Warbeck and Suffolk, but to convince them that a good understanding with him was in their own interest. His alliance with Spain to secure himself against France, was cemented by the marriage of Catharine of Aragon, a daughter of the Catholic sovereigns, with Arthur, prince of Wales, in 1501. Arthur, Catharine's husband only in name, died within five months of the ceremony, and the young widow, with papal dispensation, was betrothed to the king's second son, Henry, afterwards Henry VIII. The marriage of the king's eldest daughter Margaret to James IV. of Scotland, ended for a time the periodical invasions of the northern counties, and prepared the way for the union of the two kingdoms.

133. Ireland. The Poynings' Acts. — Whilst the native Irish had taken little or no interest in the false claimants to the English throne, the Anglo-Irish of the Pale, nobles, clergy and people, were all devoted Yorkists, and received the pretenders with open arms. To prevent any further risings in Ireland in favor of the House of York, Henry resolved to lessen the power of the nobles by destroying the independence of their Parliament, and to make the whole administration of the country directly responsible to himself. For

this purpose he created his second son Henry lord-lieutenant, appointed Sir Edward Poynings deputy, and raised other Englishmen to the highest offices connected with the administration of the Pale. Poynings passed over to Ireland, suppressed a rising against his authority, and in a Parliament at Drogheda made laws which for centuries afterwards were known as the "Poynings' Acts." The two chief acts ordained, "that no Parliament should be held in Ireland in future until the king's council in England had approved not only of its being summoned, but also of the acts which the lieutenant and council of Ireland proposed to pass in it. By the second the laws enacted before that time in England were extended to Ireland also." In virtue of this law the Irish Parliament remained in a state of complete subjection for the next three centuries.

134. Internal Policy and Character of Henry VII. — The many extortions which Henry practiced without much regard to legality, are the most painful feature of his reign. Yet he was not miserly. He valued a great reserve of money as a guarantee of peace and security, and as a means of encouraging maritime enterprises like Cabot's discovery of Newfoundland, ecclesiastical and secular architecture and scholarship. His treasure hoard enabled him to rule for thirteen years without Parliament, and to leave nearly 1,800,000*l.* to his successor. His consummate prudence was recognized by all his contemporaries. Although he made ample use of the advice of his counsellors, his policy was essentially his own: he was his own "prime minister." He himself inspired the laws which were to be passed in his few Parliaments, and were, as a rule, for the interests of the people whom he loved more than the nobles. His zeal for the Church was recognized by three successive Popes. Though cold and calculating Henry VII. gave the best of his heart, such as it was, to the service of God. The influence of his mother, the saintly countess of Richmond, over the mind of the king is undeniable. We have the testimony of the Blessed John Fisher and other contemporaries, that he had an extraordinary devotion to the Sacrament of the Altar. Henry died April 21, 1509.

Lingard: *Henry VII.*, vol. 5, ch. 6. — James Gairdner: *Henry VII.* (*Twelve English Statesmen*); *Memorials from the Reign of Henry VII.* (Rolls). — C. E. Moberly: *Henry VII.*; *The Early Tudors* (Epochs). — Stubbs: *The Reign of Henry VII.*; *Seventeen Lectures*; Lect. 15 and 16. — Green: *Henry VII.* (*Revival of Learning*), Book 5, ch. 2. — Gardiner: *Henry VII.*, v. 1, pp. 343-358. — J. Gairdner: *Richard III.* (*to Perkin Warbeck*). — W. Busch-A. Todd: *King Henry VII.*; *England under the Tudors* (introduced by J. Gairdner). — Stevenson: *Perkin Warbeck:* M. '92, Aug., p. 508. — A. Strickland: *Elisabeth of York, surnamed the Good.* — Joyce: *Poynings' Law; A Short Hist. of Ireland, p. 344, and other Histories of Ireland.* — M. H. Allies: *Church in England; Review of the Second Period* (*1066–1509*). — Dowell: *A Hist. of Taxation and Taxes from the Earliest Times to the Present Day.*

§ 6.

THE ITALIAN WARS.

135. State of Europe. — After having accomplished the unity of France, Charles VIII. turned his eyes to Italy. As heir of the House of Anjou he was titular heir of Naples, and made preparations to invade Italy. The many cities of Italy, formerly separated, were now grouped together into large states. The duchy of Milan had passed from the Visconti to the Sforza. Venice, not content with the first position in the world as a maritime power, had won a large dominion over the cities of north-eastern Italy. Florence had ceased to be a republic since 1434. The Medici, Cosimo, and still more his grandson, Lorenzo il Magnifico, had crushed the popular institutions and assumed autocratic power. The beautiful Medicean city had become the mistress of Pisa, the head of a large commercial state, and the seat of the new art and learning. The Papal States were now a greater power than ever before in the Middle Ages. The kingdom of Naples, in extent the largest Italian state, was ruled since 1442 by a line of Aragonese kings, while Sicily was directly united with Aragon. The long reign of Frederic III., however weak, and the acquisition of the Burgundian inheritance by his son Maximilian, had made the Austrian House the center of German affairs, and Maximilian I., who succeeded Frederic in 1493, was spreading Austria's influence beyond the limits of the Empire.

136. Invasion of Italy by Charles VIII., 1494–1495. — The state of Italy encouraged Charles VIII. in his plan of an Italian invasion. The people of Naples were dissatified with the tyrannical rule of their king, Alfonso II. The Florentines, guided in their policy by Savonarola, sought the protection of France against the Medici. Genoa heartily supported the French claims to Naples. Ludovico Sforza, afraid of Neapolitan designs upon Milan, invited Charles VIII. to Italy. The French fleet gathered at Genoa, whilst the army crossed the Alps and the Apennines. Pisa received the French liberator with joy and threw off the Florentine yoke. Florence expelled the Medici, proclaimed a republic and received Charles VIII. within its walls. Alexander VI. was not prepared to refuse the invaders free passage through Rome and the Papal States. Upon the approach of the French Alfonso II. fled and left the kingdom to his worthy son, Ferdinand II. Ferdinand too, after making a gallant stand on the Garigliano, had to flee before the violence of the citizens of Naples. Victorious in the kingdom, Charles entered the capital

February, 1495, and was crowned king, though the Pope refused to invest him. But the arrogance and licentiousness of the French disappointed the Italians, and the easy conquest of Naples roused the European Powers to action. The Republic of Venice, Maximilian I., Ferdinand the Catholic, Alexander VI., and even Ludovico Sforza, who had invited the French, formed a league for their expulsion from Naples. Charles retired whilst it was time, harassed but not seriously impeded by the quarreling allies. The Neapolitans rose behind him, and the military genius of the "Great Captain," Gonsalvo of Cordova, fresh from the conquest of Granada, drove the remnants of the French army from the kingdom. By the end of 1495, Ferdinand II. was in possession of Naples, soon to be succeeded by his uncle Frederic, the last Aragonese king of Naples.

137. Fra Girolamo Savonarola. — At the time of this invasion the great Dominican preacher and prior of San Marco, who for five years controlled the destiny of Florence, was at the height of his power. He had been a determined opponent of Lorenzo de' Medici, because that civic prince was the promoter of the most licentious form of the Renaissance. After the election of Alexander VI. of unhappy memory, Savonarola began to preach on his three "conclusions": The Church shall be renewed; terrible chastisement shall precede the renewal; these two things shall quickly come to pass. He announced his predictions as real prophecies, as immediate revelations of God. It was the widespread belief in Savonarola's prophetic promises which committed Florence to the alliance with France. After the flight of the Medici and the departure of Charles VIII. from Florence, the city under Fra Girolamo's guidance adopted a republican constitution with a Grand Council of 1800, and a lesser of 80 members. For this constitution with its scheme of taxation and its judicial reform the preacher claimed a directly divine sanction. With his connivance the most prominent opponents of the new order were executed. Savonarola thus became the leader of a political party and was as much hated by the opposite parties as he was admired by his own. His enemies appealed to Rome against his preaching and his prophetic claims. Alexander VI. first treated him courteously and invited him to Rome. Upon his declining the invitation the Pope forbade him to preach till his case should be decided. Savonarola defied both the Pope and the Superiors of his own Order, and thereby drew upon himself the excommunication of 1497. Advised by his friends he for several months abstained from all preaching. But on Christmas day he publicly celebrated mass and communicated the faithful. This direct challenge of papal authority was still more emphasized in his lenten sermons of 1498 in which he appealed to the Lord to send him to hell if ever he should seek absolution from this excommunication, declared

any one a heretic who should maintain the validity of the excommunication, and boldly claimed to be commissioned to preach not by any man or lord on earth, but by Him who is the Lord of Lords. Even now Alexander VI. indicated to the signory of Florence that if Fra Girolamo would only obey and cease from preaching for a while, he would absolve him and suffer him to preach again. But Savonarola did not wish for a reconciliation with the Pope and took the last step which proved fatal to him. He addressed letters to the Emperor, the kings of France, Spain, England and Hungary, in which he called on them to assemble a General Council for the purpose of deposing Alexander VI., on the ground that he was neither a true Pope nor a Christian, nay, not even a believer in the existence of God.

138. **The Catastrophe.** — In the Lent of 1498 a Franciscan friar challenged Fra Girolamo or any one who might be willing to maintain the nullity of the excommunication and the prophetic mission of Savonarola, to an ordeal by fire. Savonarola refused to accept the challenge, but hundreds of substitutes offered themselves to go through the fire in vindication of his cause. The signory, whose majority had meanwhile become unfavorable to the preacher, decreed that the Order, whose representative perished in the trial, or failed to carry out the undertaking, should be banished. When the day of the ordeal had arrived, a deadlock occurred between the two parties about one of the conditions of the trial, and the ordeal had to be abandoned. The failure of the ordeal, ascribed to the fear or policy of Savonarola, caused a popular rising, an attack on S. Marco and the arrest and trial of Savonarola and nineteen of his companions by a papal commission. Savonarola was condemned on the charge of endeavoring to procure the deposition of the Pope by means of a General Council, to be convoked by temporal sovereigns, in direct and flagrant contravention of the Bull "Execrabilis" of Pius II., which condemned an appeal from the Pope to a General Council. Two other Dominicans received the same sentence. In view of the grandeur of his ultimate purpose, the reformation of ecclesiastical abuses, the firmness of his confidence in God, and his last preparation, Savonarola's death at the stake was most edifying.

139. **Work and Character of Savonarola.** — "The severe austerity of Savonarola's life, his truly wonderful gift of prayer, his fearless intrepidity, his boundless confidence in God, his keen insight into the true condition of the Church and of civil society, his surpassing eloquence, his marvelous influence over the minds and hearts of men, an influence wielded on the whole for the noblest of ends — all these things claim the admiration which is due to a truly great and good man." But even such a character "may yet be unavailing to save a man from being misled by a subtle temptation into an unacknowledged self-esteem, which may end by sapping the very roots of obedience by luring him onwards till at last he makes his private judgment the court of final appeal." This he seems to have done by imagining and

proclaiming himself a prophet in immediate communication with God. The fact that his prophecies were never supported by supernatural evidence, that his most important predictions, e. g., the conversion of the Turks during the lifetime of the hearers, were never fulfilled, and that his own confessions during the trial were vacillating and contradictory, excludes the idea of genuine revelations, whilst the general tenor of his life seems to exclude intentional imposture. A long series of self-illusions, probably combined with good faith, may excuse him from any grievous sin, whilst, on the other hand, his judges, among whom were many eminent Dominicans, cannot be charged with judicial murder, or even excessive cruelty. In spite of the evil motives and practices of his enemies exhibited during the trial, the main facts on which his condemnation was based, were beyond question, and were sufficient for a judicial condemnation.

140. The Houses of Orleans and Angoulême.


JOHN THE GOOD, d. 1364.
CHARLES V., d. 1380.
CHARLES VI., d. 1422.
Louis, D. of Orleans, murdered by the Burgundians, 1407.
m.
Valentina Visconti, daughter of Gian Galeazzo, Duke of Milan.
CHARLES VII., d. 1461.
Charles, D. of Orleans.
John, Count of Angoulême.
LOUIS XI., d. 1483.
LOUIS XII., d. 1515:
HOUSE OF ORLEANS,
Charles, C. of Angoulême.
CHARLES VIII., d. 1498.
Claude.....m.....
FRANCIS I., d. 1547:
HOUSE OF ANGOULÊME.
HENRY II.:
HOUSE OF ORLEANS-ANGOULÊME.

141 **Louis XII. and the Conquest of Milan.** — Charles VIII. devoted the last years of his life to the cares of government and to acts of penance and charity, and dying in 1498 was succeeded by his cousin Louis of Orleans as Louis XII. (1498–1515). As grandson of Valentina Visconti he laid claim to Milan. It had been settled in the marriage contract of his grandparents that in the absence of male heirs the descendants of Valentina should succeed in the duchy of Milan. But the Empire had a prior claim, based on king Wenzel's charter (no. 32) that in the absence of male heirs Milan should

revert to the Empire. When the last Visconti, Philippo Maria, died in 1447, Francesco Sforza, Visconti's son-in-law, carried away the prize over both competitors, the Emperor and the duke of Orleans. The House of Sforza remained in undisputed possession for the rest of the century, and was recognized by both Louis XI. and Charles VIII.

By gaining over to his side Alexander VI. and Venice, Louis XII. broke up the anti-French league. Florence still clung to the French alliance. The invasion of the Milanese was a mere military promenade; French and Venetian troops overran the city and the territory. Ludovico Sforza deserted by his followers fled to the Tirolese mountains, 1499. But the following spring a rising against the extortions of the conquerors drove the French from Milan, and Sforza, reinforced by an army of Swiss mercenaries, re-entered Milan in triumph, and occupied Novara. There he was besieged by the French who had another Swiss army in their pay. To avoid a battle with their own countrymen, the Swiss of Novara betrayed the duke to Louis XII. who sent the prisoner to a French fortress for the last ten years of his life. The allies divided the spoils. Venice received Cremona and a slice of the Lombard territory; Caesar Borgia, the son of Alexander VI. and his representative in the field, obtained the government of the Romagna, whence he had to turn out a number of petty tyrants; Louis XII. retained the duchy of Milan.

142. The Reconquest of Naples. — Milan having passed under the rule of France, Louis set his mind to carry out his second plan, the conquest of Naples. In this undertaking however he had to reckon with Ferdinand of Aragon who openly posed as the protector of Frederic of Naples. As neither of the sovereigns could get the whole without a war with the other, they agreed in a secret treaty to divide the kingdom, Ferdinand to take Apulia and Calabria as grand duke, and Louis XII. the rest as king of Naples. This compact was the first of a series of partition treaties, in which peoples were handed over from one government to another without being consulted. Alexander VI. gave his assent to this scheme of spoliation. The French army reinforced by Caesar Borgia and his troops stormed Capua, received the capitulation of Gaeta and marched into Naples. Frederic who before Alexander's Bull had had no suspicion of

Ferdinand's perfidy, surrendered to the French who gave him the duchy of Anjou and a yearly pension. The Great Captain, meanwhile, overran Calabria. But hardly masters of the country, the conquerors began to quarrel among themselves, and for a second time Gonsalvo of Cordova drove the French from the country, and secured the whole kingdom of Naples to Ferdinand of Aragon.

143. **The League of Cambray.**— Alexander VI. fell a victim to the Roman fever, 1503. After the short Pontificate of the gentle Pius III., Cardinal Julian della Rovere, the most energetic opponent of Alexander VI., was chosen Pontiff and took the name of Julius II. Caesar Borgia, called upon to surrender the cities of the Romagna, fled to Naples, but was sent by Gonsalvo as prisoner to Spain, where soon after he ended his life of ambition and crime. Venice, totally miscalculating the character of Julius II., conquered or occupied city after city in the Romagna, invaded the jurisdiction of the Holy See even in spiritual matters, and treated the Pope's remonstrances with studied insolence.

Meanwhile a new coalition was forming, this time against Venice. Maximilian I. had been refused passage through the Venetian territory on his coronation trip to Rome, whereupon he assumed, with the consent of Julius, the title of "Emperor-elect." Louis XII. coveted a part of Venetian territory to round off his Milanese possessions. Ferdinand of Aragon desired the release of a number of Neapolitan ports pledged to the Republic. The three powers concluded in 1508 the League of Cambray for the purpose of attacking Venice. Julius II., who dreaded the growing power of France in Italy, did not join the League till the following year, after he had exhausted all means of bringing Venice to her senses, and had pronounced the sentence of excommunication. The French victory of Agradello, 1509, so crushed the military power of Venice, that few of her towns were able to resist the invasion. The members of the League obtained what they had fought for, Louis, an increase of his duchy, Ferdinand the Neapolitan sea-board, Julius the Romagna; only Maximilian was too weak to secure an advantage from the war. The Venetians had warded off utter destruction only by submitting to Julius II., and recognizing the rights of the Church. The absolution of Venice in 1510 was a withdrawal of Julius from the League of Cambray.

144. **The Holy League, 1511.** — Julius II., who had but reluctantly joined the League of Cambray, now personally took the field to reduce revolted cities to obedience. The peace which he had concluded with Venice, and his spirited campaign brought him into collision with Louis XII. and Maximilian I. They foolishly resolved to carry the contest into the spiritual domain of the Pope, and summoned a schismatical council to Pisa — a feeble copy of the council of Basel. Julius II. met the attack by summoning the XVIII. General Council, the V. in the Lateran to meet in 1512. Before it assembled he concluded the Holy League "for the preservation of the unity of the Church and the integrity of her patrimony" with Ferdinand of Spain and the Republic of Venice. Henry VIII. of England and Maximilian I. were invited to join. Through the Swiss bishop of Sitten, Cardinal Schinner, an enthusiastic champion of the rights of the Holy See, Julius II. had already secured the support of the Swiss Confederation.

145. Italian War of the Holy League. — The beginning of the war was not encouraging. The allies failed to take Bologna which had fallen into the hands of the French in 1511. The first battle at Ravenna resulted in the defeat of the allied forces and the loss of Ravenna and part of the Romagna. The French were, however, demoralized by the loss of their best general, Gaston of Foix, duke of Nemours. Meanwhile Maximilian abandoned his schismatical attitude, made a truce with Venice, joined the Holy League, and ordered all German mercenaries in French service to return home. A formidable army of Swiss poured into Lombardy, and in a short time cleared not only the Milanese but all Italy of the French invaders. In a Congress of the allies at Mantua Milan was given to Maximilian Sforza, Ludovico's eldest son, the Medici were reinstated at Florence in the person of Lorenzo II., son of Peter de' Medici, the Venetians recovered what they had lost in the former war; the Swiss Confederation acquired Bellinzona and the surrounding districts and the States of the Church were not only restored but enlarged by the acquisition of Parma and Piacenza.

146 Julius II. — A gigantic nature, choleric, impetuous, of an iron will and an indomitable courage and perseverance, Julius II. was guided in his undertakings by a long experience in spiritual and temporal affairs. His life, as Pope, was correct. He was not only a far-sighted statesman and enthusiastic promoter of art, but a reformer faithful to his ecclesiastical obligations and zealous for the spread of the gospel in foreign lands. In the Lateran Council he did his utmost to rescue future papal elections from

the danger of simony and to bring back the Cardinals to a sense of their responsibility. His wars were just, waged for the independence of the Church. He freed Italy without ever pursuing merely personal ends; no family clique profited by his conquests. He has rightfully earned the title of "Liberator of Italy" and "Savior of the Church." Julius II. was succeeded by Leo X. son of the Medicean Lorenzo the Magnificent and uncle to the reigning duke of Florence.

Pastor-Antrobus: *State of Italy under Paul II.*, vol. 4, pp. 3, 92, 148, 174; *under Sixtus IV.*, pp. 197–330, 348–431; *under Innocent VIII.*, vol. 5, pp. 227–374; *under Alexander VI.*, pp. 375–526, vol. 6, pp. 3–181; *under Pius III. and Julius II.*, pp. 185–454. — Creighton: *Sixtus IV. and Florence; Italian Wars; Innocent VIII.*, vol. 3, pp. 3–158; *Alexander VI.; Charles VIII. in Italy*, pp. 159–213; *The Papal States; Cesare Borgia, etc.*, pp. 249–70, vol. 4, pp. 3–66; *Julius II.; the League of Cambrai; Wars of Julius II.; the Holy League*, pp. 67–176.

Pasq.-Linda Villari: *The Two First Centuries of Florentine Hist.* — Duffy: *Tuscan Republics.* — Mrs. Oliphant: *The Makers of Florence; The Makers of Venice.* — Sismondi: *Hist. of the Ital. Republics.* — A. Trollope: *Hist. of the Commonwealth of Florence.* — B. Buser: *Die Beziehungen der Mediceer zu Frankreich*, 1434–1494. — E. Armstrong: *Lorenzo de Medici and Florence in the 15th Century.* — A. v. Reumont; Roscoe: *Lorenzo de Medici.* — Erich Frantz: *Sixtus IV. und die Republick Florenz.* — F. T. Perrens: *Hist. de Florence depuis la domination des Medicis.* — H. E. Napier: *Florentine Hist.* — W. C. Hazlitt: *Hist. of the Venetian Republic.* — A. Wiel: *Venice* (St. of N. S.). — W. P. Urquhart: *Life and Times of Francesco Sforza.*

On *Savonarola:* Pastor-Antrobus, vol. 6, pp. 3–54: *Lives of Savonarola* by: Herbert Lucas, S. J.; P. Villari; F. T. Perrens (Germ. by Schroeder); J. L. O'Neill, O. P.; E. Armstrong; Creighton: *Alexander VI. and Fra Girolamo Savonarola.* — H. Grauert: *Savonarola (Wissenschaftl. Beilage zur Germania, 1897–98).* — Reuben Parsons: vol. 3, p. 230. — V. Rev. J. Proctor, O. P.: (*S. and the Reformation*). — J. M. Stone: *S. and his Friends and Enemies:* M. 96, June, p. 207. — Q. L. Pastor: *Zur Beurtheilung S.* — J. Schnitzer: *S. im Lichte der neuesten Literatur:* H. B. P., v. 121, pp. 465, 548, 634, 717.

Prescott: *Ferdinand and Isabella.* — G. P. R. James: *Consalvez de Cordoba.* — M. J. Quintana: *The Great Captain* (Lives of Celebrated Spaniards). — A. de Reumont: Carafas: *Naples under Spanish Dominion.* — R. Parsons: *Pope Julius II.*, vol. 3, p. 256. — M. Brosch: *P. Julius II. und die Gründung des Kirchenstaates.* — Reumont: *Übergewicht politischer Tendenzen in Rom.*, vol. 3, p.1, pp. 161–286. — W. Fraknôi: *Ungarn und die Liga von Cambray.* — C. de Cherrier: *Hist. de Chas. VIII. roi de France.* — Delaborde: *L'Expédition de Charles VIII. en Italie.* — P. Lehmann: *Das Pisaner Concil von 1511.* — Blösch: *Card. Schinner.* — M. de Maulde: *Procedures politiques du regne de Louis XII.* — A. M. F. Robinson: *Valentina Visconti; the French Claim to Milan (The End of the Middle Ages).* — Kitchin (vol. 2) and other Hist. of France. See also next §.

§ 7.

THE EUROPEAN WARS OF THE HOLY LEAGUE.

147. Battles at Novara, Guinegate and Flodden, 1513. — Henry VIII. had joined the Holy League in 1512 and inspired, no doubt, by the genius of Wolsey, who had lately entered his service,

planned a division of France among the members of the League. To break up the League Louis XII. again invaded Italy, and once more supported by Venice, almost restored his power in the Milanese. But at Novara the Swiss routed the French, three times as numerous as themselves, and chased them across the Alps, 1513. The defeat of the French in Italy was rapidly followed by Henry's invasion of France. While Ferdinand conquered Navarre south of the Pyrenees, and Austrian and Spanish troops fought against Venice, Henry joined Maximilian in the siege of Terouenne and Tournay. In the battle of Guinegate, Maximilian with his men at arms supported by the English forces charged the French army of relief with such impetuosity, that the French themselves called their defeat the Battle of the Spurs. At the same time James IV. of Scotland invaded England to help his ally of France. But in the fatal battle of Flodden Field, Scotland lost nearly the whole of her peerage, and James, battle and life. Henry returned to England little pleased with the temporary peace effected in 1515 between Pope Leo X., France, Maximilian, and Ferdinand.

148. Battle of Marignano. — Louis XII. was succeeded in 1515 by his cousin Francis I., duke of Augoulême. Burning with the desire to wipe out the disgrace which Louis XII. had brought on his country, Francis renewed the League with Venice, and thereby called forth a counter-league between Leo X., Maximilian, Ferdinand, the duke of Milan, the Medici of Florence and the Swiss. The French army, 100,000 strong, entered Italy and took up a position at Marignano, by which communication between the Swiss and their badly managed allies was intercepted. The Swiss fought for two days like lions, but were overborne by the number of the French, by their artillery, and by the arrival of the Venetians on the second day of the battle. Milan surrendered to France; Maximilian Sforza agreed to live as a pensioner in France. Leo X. sacrificed Parma and Piacenza to make peace with Francis I.

Immediately after his victory at Marignano Francis I. asked and received the accolade from Bayard, a knight of his army, who had been a prominent figure in the scenes of the Italian wars and whose singular bravery, gentle-

ness, modesty and piety earned him the title of "The knight without fear or reproach."

149. The House of Hapsburg.



OF THE HOUSE OF HAPSBURG.

150. Accession of Charles I. in Spain.— The death of Ferdinand the Catholic in 1516 changed the whole aspect of European politics. Archduke Charles, the heir of Isabella in Castile and America, of Ferdinand in Aragon, Navarre, Naples and Sicily, of archduke Philip in the Netherlands, needed peace to order his kingdoms. Charles accordingly concluded a peace with Francis I. at Noyon, 1516, in which the different Powers joined. After a struggle of eight years the members of the League of Cambray restored Venice in great part to her former power in northern Italy. The military prestige of Venice, however, never recovered from the defeats suffered in the early period of these wars, and her commercial supremacy, after the recent discovery of America and the opening of new ocean routes to India, passed over to Portugal and Spain.

151. The Lateran Council. — The Lateran Council was closed in 1517. It abolished the Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges (see no. 52), and passed measures which were wise as far as they went, but inadequate to remove the evils which were universally felt and condemned. The Council could only make laws. There was no lack of salutary laws in the Church; what was wanted was the observance and execution of the canons. Only through great and holy men could a regeneration come, and God sent them in numbers, when the needs of the Church had risen highest. In the very year when the Council closed its sessions, the storm of the Protestant Revolution broke forth. With the beginning of the Lutheran movement the external history of the Papacy changes. From the position

lately adopted of Italian princes and politicians, the Popes again rise to the historical dignity of the champions of Catholic faith and morals.

Reumont: *Rom.*, vol. 3. — Gregorovius: *Rome*, vols. 7 and 8. — R. Parsons: *The Pontificate of Leo X.*, vol. 3, p. 274; *The Seventeenth (Eighteenth) General Council*, p. 265. — *Das fünfte Lateran Concil:* St., vol. 3, p. 222. — Creighton: *Beginnings of Leo X.; Francis I. in Italy: Close of the Lateran Council*, vol. 4, pp. 177–253. — L. v. Ranke: *Hist. of Latin and Teutonic Nations from 1494–1515.* — H. Leo.: *Geschichte v. Italien.* — L. Larchey: *Hist. of Bayard.* — E. Walford: *Story of the Chevalier Bayard.* — *Histories of Austria*, Coxe; Leger; F. v. Krones; (Handbuch); Huber. — E. M. Lichnowski: *Gesch. des Hauses Habsburg bis zum Tode Maximilian I.* — H. Ulmann: *K. Maximilian I.*; also H. P.-B., vol. 7, p. 444. — *Juana la Loca (insane wife of Archd. Philip the Fair):* E. R., '70, 1, p. 341. — J. Dierauer: *Gesch. der Schweizerischen Eidgenossenschaft*, vol. 2 (till 1516). — Joller: *Cardinal Schinner als Kirchenfürst.* — W. Gisi: *Der Antheil der Eidgenossen an der Europäischen Politik*, 1512–1516. — J. Fuchs: *Die Mailändischen Feldzüge der Schweizer.* — W. Havemann: *Gesch. der Italienisch-Französischen Kriege in 1494–1515.* — Dändliker: *Gesch. der Schweiz* (vol. 2, the Italian wars).

THE PAPAL EXILE AT AVIGNON.

THE PAPACY.

The Popes residing at Avignon.

CLEMENT V., 1305–1314. Transfer of the papal residence to *France*, 1305, to **AVIGNON**, 1309. Trial of the *Templars* urged by *Philip the Fair*, King of France, 1307. Suppression of the Order of the Templars by an administrative measure in the **XV. GENERAL COUNCIL OF VIENNE**, 1411–1412.

JOHN XXII., 1316–1334. In his contest with *Ludwig the Bavarian*, John strictly adhered to the principles of Innocent III., but owing to his residence at Avignon failed to win the confidence of the Germans and Italians. *Ludwig* in his Roman expedition, allied himself with the schismatical *Fraticelli*, and caused the election of the antipope *Pietro di Corvaria*, who subsequently submitted to the lawful Pope. **BENEDICT XII.**, 1334–1342, began the building of the papal palace at Avignon.

CLEMENT VI., 1342–1352, added *Avignon* by purchase from the Queen of Naples to the earlier French possession of the *Venaissin*. In Rome the career of *Cola di Rienzi*, Tribune of the people and Senator.

INNOCENT VI, 1352–1362. Reconquest of the Papal States from the petty princes who had occupied them during the Pope's absence, by Cardinal **ALBORNOZ**.

BL. URBAN V., 1362–1370. Temporary return to Rome, 1367.

GREGORY XI., 1370–1378. Rising of the Romans against the Gascon officials sent from Avignon; the support of the *Republic of Florence* and of *Milan* under *Barnabo Visconti* gave the rising a national character. **ST. CATHARINE OF SIENA**. Gregory XI. returned to Rome, 1377.

THE EMPIRE.

Emperors and Kings of Different Houses.

RUDOLF OF HAPSBURG, 1273–1291.

ADOLF OF NASSAU, 1292–1298.

ALBRECHT I. OF AUSTRIA, 1298–1308. Murdered in a conspiracy of Princes by his nephew, *John. Parricida.*

HENRY VII. OF LUXEMBURG, 1308–1313. *Bohemia* acquired by the *House of Luxemburg.* Italian expedition against *Robert of Naples.* Henry, **EMPEROR**, 1212–1213.

The double election of **LUDWIG THE BAVARIAN**, 1314–1347, and **FREDERIC OF AUSTRIA**, 1314–1330, led to a civil war which was decided at *Ampfing*, 1322, in favor of *Ludwig*. Later the two rivals were reconciled, and *Frederic* acted as regent during Ludwig's Italian expedition, 1327–1330. Bitter contest between the King and John XXII. and his successors about Ludwig's imperial pretensions. The Italian expedition turned out a dismal failure. Ludwig was deposed by a majority of the prince-electors who chose **CHARLES**, son of King *John of Bohemia*, 1346.

HOUSE OF BOHEMIA-LUXEMBURG, 1347–1437.

Charles IV., 1347–1378. **EMPEROR**, 1355–1378. **BLACK DEATH**, 1347–49. *Flagellants.* Popular risings against the *Jews*. Peaceful reign of Charles IV. First German University at *Prague.*

The *Golden Bull* regulated future elections by *law.*

The Seven Electors:

Spiritual.	*Temporal.*
The *Archbishop of Mainz*, as arch-chancellor, had to summon the Electors.	The *King of Bohemia.*
The *Archbishop of Koeln.*	The *Elector of Saxony.*
The *Archbishop of Trier.*	The *Palsgrave on the Rhine.*
	The *Margrave of Brandenburg.*

The Palsgrave and the three Archbishops were called the *Rhenish* Electors. The Electors the first dignitaries of the Empire; their territories indivisible. The election to be decided by a *majority* of votes.

THE WESTERN SCHISM AND THE CONCILIAR MOVEMENT.

Roman Line.		*Line of Avignon.*	*Line of Council of Pisa.*
URBAN VI., 1378–1389.	**INNOCENT VII.**, 1404–1406.	*Clement VII.* (*Robert of Geneva*), 1378–1394.	*Alexander V*, 1409–1410.
BONIFACE IX., 1389–1404.	**GREGORY XII.**, 1406–1415.	*Benedict XIII.* (*Peter de Luna*), 1394–1417.	*John XXIII.*, 1410–1415.

POPES AFTER THE COUNCIL OF CONSTANCE.

Martin V., 1417–1431. Eugene IV., 1431–1447. Nicolas V., 1447–1455.

The Church.

Election of **URBAN VI.** at *Rome*, lawful, April 7, 1378.

Election of **CLEMENT VII.** *Robert of Geneva* at *Fundi*, (Naples), schismatical, Sept. 20, 1378.

Causes of the schism: (a) Urban's refusal to return to Avignon. (b) His harshness in dealing with the Cardinals. (c) The encouragement and support tendered the schismatical party by *Charles V.*, King of France. The minority of states, *France* and the states dependent on France obeyed *Clement VII.*, the majority *Urban VI.* During the Pontificate of **BONIFACE IX.**: union plans of the University of Paris: a. Cession. b. Compromise, i. e. arbitration by a commission of both parties; these two methods rejected at Rome and Avignon. c. *A General Council* to compel cession or compromise, 1394. The hasty election of *Peter de Luna*, 1394, destroyed the hope of reunion.

Under **INNOCENT VII.**, 1404–1406, no change in the situation.

GREGORY XII., 1406–1415, was elected under a sworn pledge to end the schism, if necessary, by his own abdication. Failing in this, not without the fault of the opposition party, seven of his Cardinals and six Cardinals of *Benedict XIII.* summoned the **COUNCIL OF PISA**, 1409. It declared itself ecumenical, deposed the two claimants, and elected *Alexander V.* Result: instead of union, three claimants to the Papacy:

GREGORY XII., BENEDICT XIII., ALEXANDER V.

JOHN XXIII., the successor of *Alexander V.*, was induced by King Sigismund to summon the

XVI. GENERAL COUNCIL OF CONSTANCE, 1414–1418. In

The Empire.

WENZEL, eldest son of **CHARLES IV.**, sole king of the Romans, 1378–1400; opposed by *Ruprecht*, 1400–1410; reduced to Bohemia, 1410–1419. Dissolute and cruel, (*St. John Nepomucene*); his ineffective rule in Germany promoted in the north the **HANSA**, the great league of commercial cities, and caused in the south the first city-war between the *Suabian city league*, and opposing leagues of princes and knights; the cities defeated at *Doeffingen*, 1388. Growth of the **VEHME**, or secret tribunals of the Free-counts. In Italy, Wenzel sold the duchy of **MILAN** to **GALEAZZO VISCONTI**.

Palsgrave **RUPRECHT**, 1400–1410, chosen by the Rhenish Electors against Wenzel, and recognized as King of the Romans by *Boniface IX.*

Ruprecht throughout his reign recognized *Gregory XII.* His ambassadors to the *Council of Pisa* opposed Gregory's deposition.

At the death of Ruprecht, *Wenzel* still claimed to be King of the Romans. But the Electors proceeded to a new election, divided, and chose two instead of one candidate to the imperial crown. Hence three claimants to the Empire:

WENZEL, SIGISMUND, JOBST OF MORAVIA (d. 1411).

SIGISMUND, younger son of *Charles IV.*, *King of Hungary* by marriage, *King of Romans*, 1410–1433, *King of Bohemia*, 1419, **EMPEROR**, 1433–1437.

THE PAPAL EXILE AT AVIGNON — *Continued.*

its first stage it was an international congress of Christendom. In this stage it passed the famous declaration of the *superiority of a General Council over the Pope.* It became a representative ecclesiastical Council, when the obediences of Rome and Avignon joined it, 1415-17. It became a **GENERAL COUNCIL**, when Pope **MARTIN V.** presided over it. Three causes were to be treated: the cause of union, of faith, of reform.

Causa unionis — 1. It deposed John XXIII. 2. It was convoked anew by *Gregory XII.*, and under the authority of this convocation accepted his free resignation, 1415. 3. It deposed *Benedict XIII.*, after he had been abandoned by his own obedience. 4. It elected **MARTIN V.**, and thus ended the schism.

Causa fidei: It condemned the heresies of *John Wyclif*, *John Hus* and *Jerome of Prague*, and handed over the two latter to the secular arm for punishment.

The *Causa reformationis* made little progress owing to national jealousies. Hence separate concordats concluded between Martin V. and the different nations.

THE COUNCIL OF BASEL, 1431-1448, summoned by **MARTIN V** and held under the saintly **EUGENE IV.**, was from the beginning ultra-democratic in membership and principles, and became openly schismatic, 1437. The orthodox members withdrew to *Ferrara*, whither Eugene IV. had summoned the East and the West for the purpose of healing the *Eastern Schism.* The schismatics remaining in Basel put up the *last* antipope in the person of Duke *Amadee of Savoy* (*Felix V.*), who later submitted to Nicolas V.

THE XVII. GENERAL COUNCIL OF FERRARA-FLORENCE, 1438-1439, effected the dogmatical union of the Roman with the Eastern Churches, and terminated the Conciliar crisis by declaring the Pope the head of the whole Church, therefore also of a General Council.

In 1415, Sigismund conferred on *Frederic of Nürnberg*, of the House of *Hohenzollern*, the Mark and Electorship of *Brandenburg.* Beginning of the present *Prussian* dynasty.

THE HUSSITE WARS, 1419-1436.

Chief parties: Utraquists and *Calixtines; Taborites* and *Orphans, Moderates* and *Irreconcilables.*

Chief Leaders: Ziska, Procopius the Great.

Character: The destructive teachings of, and the atrocities committed by the extreme Hussite parties surpassed anything known heretofore in the history of a Christian nation.

Result: The Irreconcilables were annihilated in the battle of *Lipan*, 1434. Pacification by the *Compact of Iglau*, in which the *Council of Basel* allowed the use of the chalice to those who professed their faith in the Real Presence under *one* species. *Sigismund* acknowledged as King of Bohemia, entered Prague, 1436.

HOUSE OF HAPSBURG, 1438-X.

ALBRECHT II., 1438-1439, son-in-law of *Sigismund.*

FREDERIC III., 1439-1493, the last **EMPEROR** crowned in *Rome*, 1452. During his long, dull and inactive reign Germany exercised no influence on European affairs. Nothing was done to check the advance of the **OTTOMAN TURKS**, whilst sanguinary feuds were carried on with impunity in the *Palatinate, Bavaria, Thuringia, Switzerland* and *Silesia.*

The *Hungarians* and *Bohemians* elected native kings, the former *George Podiebrad*, the latter *Mathias Corvinus*, whom *Frederic III.* was too weak to reduce to submission. A new outbreak of Hussite troubles was finally settled under *Ladislas, King of Poland and Bohemia*, the *Taborites* forming the separate community of the *Bohemian Brothers.*

THE HUNDRED YEARS' WAR.

Kings in France and England.

HOUSE OF CAPET. **PHILIP IV. THE FAIR**, d. 1314.

Louis X., d. 1316. *Philip V.*, d. 1322. *Charles IV*, d. 1328.

HOUSE OF VALOIS, 1328–1589.
PHILIP VI., nephew of *Philip the Fair*, 1328–1350.
JOHN THE GOOD, 1350–1364.
CHARLES V., THE WISE, 1364–1380.
Charles VI., 1380–1422.
CHARLES VII., 1422–1461.
LOUIS XI., 1461–1483.
CHARLES VIII., 1483–1498.

House of Orleans.
LOUIS XII. 1498–1515.

HOUSE OF ANJOU OR PLANTAGENET.
EDWARD II., 1307–1327.
EDWARD III, 1327–1377.
Richard II., 1377–1399.

HOUSE OF LANCASTER, 1399–1461.
HENRY IV., 1399–1413.
HENRY V., 1413–1422.
HENRY VI., 1422–1461.

HOUSE OF YORK, 1461–1485.
EDWARD IV., 1461–1483.
EDWARD V., 1483.
RICHARD III., 1483–1485.

HOUSE OF TUDOR, 1485–1603.
HENRY VII., 1485–1509.

EVENTS PRECEDING THE HUNDRED YEARS' WAR.

Wars and Campaigns:	*Battles of:*	*Victory of:*	*Internal Affairs.*
Scotch War under *Edward II.* Irish War, 1315–1318. Conquest of the greater part of Ireland by **EDWARD BRUCE**, King Robert's brother, supported by the Irish patriots.	**BANNOCKBURN**, 1314. *Conquest of Scotland.*	**ROBERT BRUCE** over *Edward II.*	**MARRIAGE OF EDWARD II.** with **ISABELLA OF FRANCE.** The barons led by *Thomas of Lancaster* restrict the King's power by the *Ordinances* of 1311 (*Council of Ordainers*).
Edward III. first recognized the independence of Scotland, but renewed the war in 1332	**DUNDALK**, 1318.	Defeat and fall of *Edward Bruce* by the English party.	**CIVIL WAR.** The Lancaster party defeated, and Thomas executed 1322. The King betrayed, deposed and murdered by his wife and her paramour, *Roger Mortimer*, 1326–27.
	HALIDON HILL, 1333.	**EDWARD III.** over the Scots.	

THE HUNDRED YEARS' WAR — *Continued.*

CAUSES OF THE HUNDRED YEARS' WAR.

1. The hereditary jealousy of England and France, since the English Kings became powerful French vassals (1066).
2. The marriage of *Edward II.* with *Isabella of France.* Edward III.'s contention that his mother, though not capable of succeeding to the French crown, could transmit the succession to him, was denied by the Peers of France. In 1331 Edward freely acknowledged the title of *Philip of Valois.*
3. The assistance which *Philip VI.* gave to the Scots against *Edward III.*, and the protection which he afforded to young *David Bruce* in France.
4. The alliance offered by the *Flemings* who were in revolt both against their count and their French suzerain, if Edward III. would renew his claims to the French crown.
5. The attacks of *Philip VI.* upon the *English coast* and the remaining English possessions in *Aquitaine.*

THE HUNDRED YEARS' WAR.

FIRST PERIOD, 1337-1360; *from the Declaration* of War *by Edward III. to the Peace of Bretigny.*

Campaigns.	*Battles.*	*Victory of:*	*Treaties of Peace. Internal Affairs.*
Under **PHILIP VI.** (1328-1350).—Edward's first campaign in the *North of France* unsuccessful (1338-40). Naval campaign. Scotch truce after an unsuccessful invasion, 1342.	**NAVAL BATTLE OFF SLUYS**, 1340.	*Edward III.* destroys the French fleet. English supremacy in the Channel.	In England. (1) Heavy taxation throughout the war; forced loans; "arrests" of ships and other illegal means of raising subsidies.
Edward's invasion of France, 1345-1347.	**CRÉCY**, 1346.	*Edward* and the *Black Prince* over the French Chivalry. Engl. Archers.	(2) Edward's victories caused a great influx of treasure into England, and a period of festivities and luxury interrupted by:
Scotch invasion of England, 1346.	**NEVILLE'S CROSS**, 1346.	*Prince Lionel* over *David Bruce.* David prisoner in London.	(3) The great plague, the **BLACK DEATH**, 1348-1349. First *Statute of Laborers*, 1349.
Edward's campaign in France, under **JOHN THE GOOD** (1350-1364).	**CAPTURE OF CALAIS**, 1347.	Calais English, 1347-1558.	In France. (1) Miserable state of the peasants who had to make up the ransoms for their lords, and were harassed by plundering "companies."
Invasion of *Brittany* by *Henry of Lancaster*, 1355.			(2) The **JACQUERIE**, rising of 100,000 peasants against their lords, 1358.
Invasion of *Picardy* and *Artois* by			

Edward III., 1355, followed by his invasion of Scotland.
Invasion of southern France by the *Black Prince*, 1355.
Truce 1357–59. Edward's last invasion, 1359–60

Burnt Candlemas, 1356.
Battle near Edinburgh.
POITIERS. 1356.

Scots over Edward's army.
The *Black Prince* over *John the Good.* John prisoner in London; *K. David* released, 1357.

(3) **CIVIL WAR.** (a) Paris under *Etienne Marcel*, (b) *Charles the Bad of Navarre* against the Regent, *Charles D. of Normandy.*
PEACE OF BRETIGNY, 1360. The *Loire* made the boundary between the French and English possessions.

SECOND PERIOD, 1367-1380. *Victories of* **BERTRAND DU GUESCLIN** *and English reverses.*

Under **CHARLES V. THE WISE** (1364-1380). *Spanish* campaign of the *Black Prince* in support of his ally, *Pedro the Cruel*, against *Henry Trastamare of Castile*, 1367.

Navarette, 1367.

The *Black Prince* over *Henry Trastamare.*

IN ENGLAND. Intrigues at the English court; *John of Gaunt*, supported by *Alice Perrers* and *John Wyclif*, head of anti-clerical and anti-dynastic party. His designs upon the crown defeated by the *Black Prince* and the *House of Commons.* **STATUTE OF KILKENNY**, 1367.
IN FRANCE. The prudent administration of Charles the Wise restored the country to some measure of prosperity.

The *Black Prince* summoned before the court of *Charles V.*, refused to acknowledge the King's overlordship. Declaration of war by *Charles V.*, 1369. *Edward III.* reassumes the title of King of France. Victorious campaign of **BERTRAND DU GUESCLIN**, reducing the English possessions to *Calais*, *Cherbourg*, *Brest*, *Bayonne* and *Bordeaux*, 1369-1375. Truce, 1375–1382.

8

CIVIL WAR IN ENGLAND.

1. *The Wat Tyler Insurrection*, the "Jacquerie" of England, a result of the economic conditions, and the Wyclifite agitation, 1381.
2. The five *Lords Appellant*, *Gloucester*, *Arundel*, *Warwick*, *Nottingham* and *Derby*, at the head of 40,000 men take possession of London, and in the *Merciless Parliament* impeach, execute or banish the King's ministers, 1388.
3. **RICHARD II 's** personal rule and constitutional government, 1389–1397.
4. Richard's *coup d'etat*, banishing the *Dukes of Norfolk* and *Hereford* (Henry of Lancaster), and confiscating the *Duchy of Lancaster*, 1397.
5. Landing of *Henry of Lancaster* during *Richard's* absence in *Ireland.* General treachery. *Richard II.* deposed and murdered, and the crown of England usurped by Henry, Duke of Lancaster, 1389–1399. **HENRY IV.**, 1399–1413.
6. Risings in Wales under *Owen Glendower.* Rising of the *Percies* in favor of the *Earl of March*, the heir of *Lionel;* the Percies defeated at *Shrewsbury*, 1403. New rising in *Yorkshire*, 1405; execution of *Scrope*, *Archbishop of York.*
7. Second *Wyclifite* rising under *Sir John Oldcastle*, suppressed by **HENRY V.**, 1413–1414.

THE HUNDRED YEARS' WAR — *Continued.*

CIVIL WAR IN FRANCE.

1. The intermittent insanity of *Charles VI.* since 1392, led to a civil war for the regency between two parties,
   (a) The *Orleanist* party: *Louis Duke of Orleans*, murdered by the Burgundians, 1407; the *Count of Armagnac; Queen Isabel*, supported by the feudal nobility.
   (b) The *Burgundian Party: Philip the Bold* and *John the Fearless*, successive Dukes of *Burgundy*, supported by *Paris* and the northern cities.
2. The *Armagnacs* obtain possession of *Paris* and of the person of the King, 1410.
3. *Armagnac*, joined by the *Dauphin Charles* (afterwards Charles VII), established a reign of terror in Paris.
4. Alliance between *John the Fearless* and *Queen Isabel* against *Armagnac*. *Isabel* Regent at *Troyes*.
5. Paris taken by the *Burgundians*, 1418. Murder of *Armagnac* and 2,000 adherents. Flight of the Dauphin.
6. The attempted reconciliation of the parties upon the approach of the English frustrated by the murder of *John the Fearless* on the bridge of *Montereau*, 1419.
7. Thereupon the *Queen-regent, Philip the Good* of Burgundy and the *City of Paris* surrender France to King *Henry V.* in the *Treaty of Troyes*, 1420.

THIRD PERIOD OF THE HUNDRED YEARS' WAR, 1415–1422. *The Victories of* HENRY V.

First invasion of France, 1415. | Taking of *Harfleur;* **AGINCOURT**, 1415. | **HENRY V.** over the French chivalry. Conquest of *Normandy.* | **THE PEACE OF TROYES**, 1420. *Henry V.* to be married to *Catharine of France*, and to be Regent of France during the lifetime of *Charles VI.*, and King after his death. England and France to remain separate under one crown.

Second invasion of France, 1417–1420, *Henry V.* in southern France; his death, 1422.

IN ENGLAND. HENRY VI., the child of *Henry V.*, succeeded under the guardianship of his uncle, the Duke of *Gloucester.*

IN FRANCE. The King's uncle, the *Duke of Bedford*, acted as Regent north of the *Loire; Charles the Dauphin* south of the Loire.

FOURTH PERIOD, 1422–1453. *The Epoch of* **JEAN D'ARC** *and the Expulsion of the English from France.*

The campaign of **JEAN D'ARC**, 1429–1430.	**RELIEF OF ORLEANS**, 1429.	Brought about by the *Maid of Orleans*.	**IN FRANCE.** The iniquitous trial and execution of the *Maid of Orleans* by the English party at *Rouen*, 1430.
	CORONATION OF CHARLES VII. AT RHEIMS, 1429.		Marriage of *Henry VI.* with *Margaret of Anjou*. Truce, 1445.
Termination of the Hundred Years' War.	**PARIS** recovered, 1434.	By *Charles VII.*	
	Rouen and *Normandy* lost, 1450.	By the English.	
	Guienne and *Gascony* lost, 1453.	By the English.	
The war ended without a formal conclusion of peace.	*Calais* the only English city in France.		

THE WARS OF THE ROSES, 1455–1485.

CAUSES.— 1. The usurpation of the *House of Lancaster* which was resented by the Houses of *March* and *York* and their adherents.

2. Political opposition in foreign affairs between the *war party* and the *peace party*, the latter represented by the *House of Lancaster*.

3. The marriage of *Richard, Earl of Cambridge*, with *Anne*, the heiress of *Lionel*, on which their son, *Richard, Duke of York*, based his claim to the throne. (See genealogy, no. 87). The murder of *Suffolk*, and *Jack Cade's* rebellion were probably caused by *Richard of York*, then Lord Lieutenant in Ireland.

4. The landing of *Richard of York* with a small army, and the organization of a party for the overthrow of *Edmund Beaufort, Duke of Somerset*, the mainstay of the Lancastrian House.

5. The birth of *Edward, Prince of Wales*, to *Henry VII.* and *Queen Margaret*, which destroyed *Richard's* hope of a peaceful succession.

6. The evil of "*liveries and maintenance*," by which the nobles, since *Richard II.*, surrounded themselves with armed retainers instead of vassals. They received from their lords full support and uniforms marked with badges (*liveries*).

7. Large bands of unruly men, having lost employment in France, flocked to the standards of English nobles, who, with their aid, defied King and laws.

THE WARS OF THE ROSES — *Continued.*

Party Alliances.	*Battles.*	*Victory of:*	*Results.*
Richard of York, his two sons, *Edward, Earl of March* (afterwards Edward IV.) and the *Earl of Rutland*, and the *Nevilles, Richard, Earl of Salisbury* and *Richard, Earl of Warwick* against *Henry VI.* and his energetic **QUEEN MARGARET** supported by the majority of the nobles.	First battle of **ST. ALBANS**, 1455.	The *Yorkists* over the Royalists under *Somerset.*	*Somerset's* fall on the battlefield. Protectorate of *Richard of York.* General Pacification at *St. Paul's*, 1458.
	NORTHAMPTON, 1460.	*Yorkists.*	The King a prisoner of the Yorkists. Flight of the Queen and Prince to *Scotland.* *York* formally claims the crown.
	WAKEFIELD, 1461.	The *Queen* over the *Yorkists.*	Fall of *York, Rutland* and *Salisbury.*
	MORTIMER'S CROSS, 1461.	*Edward, D. of York.*	
	(2d) **ST. ALBANS**, 1461.	*The Queen* over *Warwick.*	*Henry VI.* delivered from captivity.
	TOWTON, 1461.	*Edward IV.* over *Henry VI.* and *Queen Margaret.*	Union of *Edward's* and *Warwick's* forces at *London;* proclamation of York as **EDWARD IV.** Bill of attainder and forfeiture passed against the *House of Lancaster.* **HOUSE OF YORK**, 1461–1485.
Warwick and *Clarence*, the King's brother, against *Edward IV.*	*Hedgeley Moor* and *Hexham*, 1464.	Lord *Montague* (Warwick's brother) over *Queen Margaret.*	*Henry IV.* recaptured and lodged in the Tower.
	Stamford, 1470.	*Edward* over *Clarence* and *Warwick.*	Flight of *Clarence* and *Warwick* to *France.*
Reconciliation of Margaret of Anjou with Warwick, allied against Edward IV.	*Warwick's landing*, 1470.	*Edward* deserted by his forces.	Flight of *Edward IV.* to *Burgundy.* Restoration of *Henry VI.*
Edward IV., perjured *Clarence* and their youngest brother *Richard of Gloucester* against *Henry VI.*, *Queen Margaret* and *Warwick* "the King-maker."	Landing of *Edward* and entrance into London, 1471.		Third captivity of Henry VI.
	BARNET, 1471.	*Edward IV.*, over *Warwick.*	Fall of *Warwick.*
Dissensions in the royal family led to the execution of *Clarence.*	**TEWKESBURY**, 1471.	*Edward IV.* over *Queen Margaret.*	Murder of *Henry VI.* and *Edward, Prince of Wales.* Captivity of *Queen Margaret*, (ransomed, 1475).

After the death of *Edward VI.*, 1483, *Richard, Duke of Gloucester*, allied himself with *Henry, Duke of Buckingham*, against *Edward's children*, *Edward V.* and *Richard, Duke of York*. The royal boys lodged in the Tower. *Richard* proclaimed himself as King **RICHARD III.**, and was accepted by the Parliament. Murder of the royal children in the Tower.

Alliance of *Buckingham*, the *Woodvilles*, the *Lancastrians*, and many *Yorkists* with *Henry of Richmond*, the only surviving member of the *Beaufort* line. *Buckingham* betrayed and executed.	**BOSWORTH**, 1485.	*Henry of Richmond* over *Richard III.*, who fell in the battle.	*Henry of Richmond* proclaimed and crowned as **HENRY VII.** on the battlefield. **HOUSE OF TUDOR**, 1485–1603. Union of the *Roses* by the marriage of *Henry VII.* and *Elisabeth of York*.

CONSOLIDATION OF THE EUROPEAN MONARCHIES.

I. The **STATES OF THE CHURCH** were consolidated by the Popes who obtained a firm possession of the eternal city after the *Conciliar Movement*. The earlier Popes of the period were at the same time the defenders of Europe against the encroachments of the *Turks*. Those of the fifteenth century became more and more *Italian princes*. The first rank in the consolidation of the Papal States is due to **JULIUS II.**

Defenders of Europe.		*Italian Princes.*	
EUGENE IV.	1431–1447.	*Sixtus IV.*	1471–1484.
NICHOLAS V.	1447–1455.	*Innocent VIII.*	1484–1492.
CALIXTUS III.	1455–1458.	*Alexander VI.*	1492–1503.
PIUS II.	1458–1464.	**JULIUS II.**	1503–1513.
Paul II.	1464–1471.	**LEO X.**	1513–1521.

II. The **EMPIRE OF THE OTTOMAN TURKS** (so-called from their chief *Osman*).

1. Advancing from *Iconium* the Turks establish a new state at *Brussa* under *Osman*, 1326.
2. From *Brussa* they enter *Europe*, 1357, and make *Hadrianople* their first capital under *Amurath I.*, 1361, whence they spread over the peninsula.
3. Defeat of the *Servians* and *Bosnians* at *Kossowa*, 1389.
4. Defeat of an army of 100,000 Frenchmen, Germans and Hungarians under *Sigismund* by the Turks under *Bajazet I.*, "the *Lightning*," at *Nicopolis*, 1396.
5. The *conquest of Constantinople* was delayed by the great invasion of the **MONGOLS** under **TIMUR** or **TAMERLANE**. *Bajazet* defeated and captured by *Tamerlane* at **ANGORA**, 1402. The Mongolian Empire broke up with Tamerlane's death, 1405.

CONSOLIDATION OF THE EUROPEAN MONARCHIES — *Continued.*

6. The defense of Europe was
   (a) *Inspired* by the Popes: *Eugene IV.* (*Cardinal Cesarini*), *Nicholas V.*, **CALIXTUS III.** (Cardinals *Scarampo* and *Carvajal*; *St. John Capistrano*) and **PIUS II.**
   (b) *Conducted* by **HUNYADI**, *Duke of Transilvania* and regent of *Hungary*; **GEORGE KASTRIOTA, "SKANDERBEG,"** Prince of *Albania*; **MATHIAS CORVINUS,** *Hunyadi's* son, King of *Hungary.*
   (c) *Chief Military Operations: Hunyadi's* victory at **NISH**, 1443; *Amurath II.'s* victories at **VARNA**, 1444, and **KOSSOWA**, 1448, **CONQUEST OF CONSTANTINOPLE** by **MAHOMET II**, 1453, fall of *Constantine XII.*; victory and relief of **BELGRADE** by *Hunyadi*, 1456. *Skanderbeg's* great victory at **TAMORNIZA**, 1456; heroic defense of **CROYA** by *Skanderbeg*, 1466 and 1467; further conquests of the Turks (*Servia, Morea, Trebizond, Bosnia, Slavonia*), 1458–1460; the Turkish fleet defeated at *Otranto*, 1480. The unwarlike successors of *Mahomet II.* gave a respite to Western Christendom.
7. The *Turks* owed their great successes
   (a) To the helplessness of the *Greek Empire*, internally torn up by the schism, and externally harassed by the *Bulgarians* and *Servians.*
   (b) To the distraction of Western Christendom by the *Exile* and the *Western Schism.*
   (c) To the weakness and inactivity of Emperor *Frederic III.* *Venice* was too weak to defend its eastern possessions.
   (d) To the splendid organization of the Turkish army, which, in 1350, obtained in the *Janissaries* the first standing army, while its light and mobile cavalry had a decided advantage over the heavier equipment of their foes.

III. **SWITZERLAND** seceded from its Austrian lords and maintained its secession in the battles of *Morgarten* (1315), *Sempach* (1386), *Näfels* (1388), and in a final war with Frederic III allied with Charles VII. of France, 1446. Its form of government was republican. The Swiss consolidated their independence by their victories of **GRANSON, MURTEN** (1476), and **NANCY** (1477), over **CHARLES THE BOLD OF BURGUNDY**. In the *Italian* wars Swiss regiments, now the best infantry of Europe, served on both sides. The Swiss Confederacy was finally recognized by Europe in the *Peace of Westphalia*, 1648.

IV. The greatness of **AUSTRIA** was founded by the hereditary succession of the **HOUSE OF HAPSBURG** in the **EMPIRE**, and by the acquisition of the splendid **BURGUNDIAN** inheritance through the marriage of *Maximilian* (*I.*) with *Mary of Burgundy.*

V. The **KINGDOM OF FRANCE** was consolidated:
   (a) Under **CHARLES VII.** by the organization of a standing army and the introduction of a permanent tax (*Taille*).
   (b) Under **LOUIS XI.** by his victory over the *League of the Commonweal* (four dukes) and the acquisition of *Burgundy* (the duchy), *Anjou* and *Provence* with its claims to *Naples.*
   (c) Under **CHARLES VIII.** by the incorporation of *Brittany* and *Orleans* with the crown. The consolidation was accomplished by the alliance of the crown with the Church and the cities. France, thus strengthened, opened its career of foreign conquest under *Charles VIII.*

VI. **PORTUGAL** owed its period of greatness:

(a) To the conquest of *Algarve* on both sides of the sea.

(b) To the discoveries on the west coast of *Africa* (*Madeira*, the *Canaries*, etc.).

(c) To the discovery of the **CAPE OF GOOD HOPE** by *Bartholomew Diaz* (1486), and of the ocean passage to India by **VASCO DA GAMA** (1498).

(d) To the foundation of a great **EAST-INDIAN EMPIRE.**

(e) To the discovery of **BRAZIL** by *Pedro Alvarez Cabral*, 1500.

VII. **SPAIN** was united and consolidated:

(a) By the marriage of **ISABELLA OF CASTILE** and **FERDINAND OF ARAGON**, which secured the union of all Spain.

(b) By the conquest of the city and kingdom of **GRANADA**, 1481–1491.

(c) By the discoveries of **COLUMBUS** and the acquisition of *Mexico*, *Florida*, *Central America*, and all *South America*, except *Brazil*.

(d) By the acquisition of **NAPLES**, 1504 (in addition to *Sardinia* and *Sicily*), and the kingdom of *Navarre*, 1412.

(e) By the promotion of the interests of the cities (*Hermandad*).

(f) By the tribunal of the *Spanish Inquisition*, which excluded the religious wars devastating other countries of Europe.

CHAPTER IV.

CHARACTER OF THE PERIOD.

§ 1.

THE INQUISITION.

151. General Principles.— The origins of the Inquisition, i. e., the investigation and punishment of heresy, apostasy, sacrilege, and other crimes against religion, date back to the institution of the Church and the earliest Christian antiquity. (a) Christ divinely commissioned the Church to preach and preserve His religion unchanged among all nations to the end of time. For this purpose He conferred upon the Apostles the power of teaching and ruling, of making laws and judging and punishing transgressors.

(b) The Church always recognized the distinction between the baptized and the unbaptized. The former becoming rebels by apostasy do not cease to be her subjects, and can be lawfully coerced and punished; the latter not being her subjects cannot be forced to accept the faith, or punished for not accepting it.

(c) In the case of Christians guilty of heresy, the Church is bound first to admonish and warn them in all charity and patience, to impose penalties calculated to change their minds, and finally, all other means failing, to excommunicate them.

(d) The civil power, too, in a thoroughly Christian (Catholic) state has the right of punishing heresy based on both the natural and the revealed law. As to the latter, this right rests on the words of St. Paul: The prince "is God's minister: an avenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil." (Rom. 13.) The same Apostle teaches that heresy is a great crime.

(e) Whilst the Church declared it lawful for the state to punish heretics, she never declared it necesssary or always expedient to do so. The *right* of punishing or repressing heresy becomes a *duty*, when severe measures are indispensable for the protection of the faithful, or the preservation of human society. The Church has a right to invoke the secular arm for her protection.

(f) Accordingly from the time when the state became Catholic under Constantine the Great, the Roman Law decreed severe penalties, such as confiscation of property, exile, imprisonment, bodily correction, incapability of inheriting or making wills, loss of civil rights and public infamy, against heretics of both sexes and other violators of the Christian religion. It considered heresy as an offense not only against the faith, but also against the

state equivalent to high treason, as a felonious attack upon the highest good of civil society, the unity of faith, and therefore punishable by the civil authority on its own account. "What is done against the divine religion is an injury done to all." "It is far more grievous to offend the divine than any human majesty."

(g) The Teutonic nations after their conversion took the same view of heresy. The Saxon and Suabian laws, the legislation of Frederic II. who introduced burning as the punishment of heresy in the whole Empire, the laws of the English kings and Parliaments, increased the severity of the punishment to be inflicted on obstinate heretics. The reason was the far greater danger with which the Albigensians, the Hussites, the Lollards and kindred sects threatened the stability of marriage, private ownership, the very foundations of all social order, Christianity itself in Church and State, by means of widespread conspiracies and powerful military political organizations. Bishops, legates, Popes, fifty-two synods, among them three General Councils, testified to the imminence of the danger.

152. The Ecclesiastical Inquisition and its Procedure. — The Ecclesiastical Tribunal of the Inquisition was not instituted at once, but developed gradually. The first decree, ordering the bishops to *inquire* into the presence of heretics in their dioceses (Episcopal Inquisition) was issued by Lucius III. in 1183. By the time of the IV. Lateran Council (1215) and the synod of Toulouse (1229) the principal rules of the institution were established. On account of the negligence and corruption of some inquisitors, Gregory IX. in 1232 appointed the Dominicans as inquisitors (Papal Inquisition), without thereby excluding other Orders or abolishing the Episcopal Inquisition. The procedure began with the citation. If the suspected party obeyed the summons within a specified time, all risk of a severe punishment was precluded. If he refused to obey the summons, he was arrested. As the juridical view universally prevalent put heresy on the same level as high treason, the maxims of the Roman law concerning the crimen laesae majestatis were applied to the case. It was for this reason (a), that everybody was bound to accuse or testify, (b) that the names of the witnesses were not made known to the accused, who had, however, the right of naming his personal enemies, thereby excluding them from the witness stand. Besides a commission of reliable men had to decide upon the fitness of the witnesses. (c) The accused could be subjected to the rack, though under important restrictions and in a milder form than that used by the secular courts. If the first hearing showed the innocence of the accused he was at once set free. If the case remained doubtful, he was either released under condition of reappearing on a stated day, or detained for further investigation. The final sentence was passed by the Inquisitor in union with the respective bishop assisted by a council of theologians, jurists and other prominent men. The acts of the trial were laid before the bishop in full, before the council in substance. The solemn promulgation of the sentence called *sermo*, took

place in the cathedral or principal church with appropriate ceremonies in the presence of all the people. The "sermo" had three parts: (1) The promulgation of graces; it commuted the penalties of those who had been sentenced in a previous sermo into lighter penances or entirely canceled them. (2) The promulgation of the current sentences. Four kinds of punishment could be imposed, (a) minatory penalties (comminatoriæ), usually conditional excommunication, (b) minor penances (minores) such as good works, alms, fasts, or pilgrimages. (c) Defamatory punishments, the public wearing of habiliments marked with certain signs which often indicated the nature of the crime. Thus, yellow crosses betrayed the heretic, yellow discs the practicers of magic, four red tongues false witnesses. (d) Finally the major punishments (maiores), the confiscation of property, perpetual imprisonment or death. These sentences were rarely inflicted, and when inflicted often changed into lighter ones at a subsequent sermo. Pecuniary fines to be inflicted on the three first classes were prohibited since 1244. The Inquisitors waged many a fearless combat with royal officials to save the property of those who did not belong to the fourth class. (3) The third part of the sermo was devoted to the sentencing of absent or fugitive members.

To judge the Inquisition rightly the principle must be distinguished from its application. It cannot be denied that in the latter there were grave and lamentable defects. Some of the Dominicans became obnoxious from overzeal and excessive severity. Several Inquisitors were murdered (Card. Hergenroether).

153. **The Spanish Inquisition — Causes.**— The Spanish Inquisition owed its origin to the intrigues of the Maraños and Moriscos, i. e., Jews and Moors, who feigned conversion and got themselves baptized in order to pursue with greater safety their sinister purpose of undermining the Catholicity and nationality of the Spanish people. The moral corruption, the perfidy, the greedy ambition and the heartless usury of the Maraños, and especially their secret connection with the enemies of Christianity in Spain and Africa, called for the most energetic and extraordinary means of repression. When Ferdinand and Isabella ascended the throne the coasts of Northern Africa were teeming with Mohammedans, the Mediterranean was fast becoming a Turkish sea, Granada was still the independent centre of millions of Moors and Moriscos scattered through the mountains of Granada, Murcia and Valencia, and the ports of Malaga, Almeria, etc., were ready at any moment to receive a Turkish fleet. In the rest of Spain the Maraños, during the last two centuries, had acquired an ever-growing influence. In a blind policy of selfishness king after king had increased their privileges. They managed the royal treasury. They were admitted to the highest offices. They sat in the king's council. Many or them had obtained high ecclesiastical preferments, even bishoprics. Their immense wealth enabled them to intermarry with the noblest families of the land. They were using the advantages of their posi-

tion with the determined aim to create Judaism on the ruins of Spanish Catholicity and nationality. They approached Isabella herself with the offer of instructing her in their creed. The question for Catholic Spain was to be or not to be. The danger grew apace when the number of the Moriscos, the national allies of the Marańos, swelled to large proportions in consequence of the conquest of Granada.

154. Establishment and Organization. — Under these circumstances the Catholic sovereigns asked for and obtained from Sixtus IV. the permission to establish a tribunal for searching out and punishing "heretics," as the Marańos and Moriscos were called, 1478. The Pope made the condition that the judges should be at least forty years of age, of irreproachable character, masters or bachelors of theology, and doctors or licentiates of canon law. In 1483 Sixtus IV. conferred on the Dominican Thomas Torquemada the office of Grand Inquisitor, or president of the highest tribunal with the right of receiving appeals from all the lower tribunals, and of delegating his powers to others. Whilst the Grand Inquisitor was to be nominated by the king, he received his canonical confirmation from the Holy See. Hence the Spanish Inquisition was a mixed tribunal with the preponderance of authority on the side of the Church. The Popes never gave up their right of receiving appeals. The Grand Inquisitor was assisted by a Council of Five. Without consulting him no provincial inquisitor could imprison a priest, a knight or a nobleman. Every baptized individual belonging to the Spanish monarchy, grandees, bishops, the king himself and the royal court were subject to the High Tribunal. The procedure was on the whole the same as in the ecclesiastical courts of inquisition. The tribunal invariably began its sessions by proclaiming a season of grace of 40 or 60 or even 120 days. All who came forward during such periods, and confessed their heresy, even if it were a relapse, were reconciled without incurring any severe penance. The court never proceeded against unconverted Jews or Moors. No arrest could be made before the guilt was proved, and every arrest required a unanimous vote. The severest punishments, even death, awaited false witnesses. Every sentence needed the confirmation of the highest tribunal which was obliged to examine all the proceedings of the lower tribunals. The prisons were dry, vaulted rooms, with plenty of light. The sick were well cared for.

There were, however, three points in which the Spanish Inquisition differed from similar courts in other countries: (1) Its monarchical constitution culminating in the Grand Inquisitor. (2) The consequent centralization of all the local tribunals (19 in number) in the High Tribunal of Sevilla. (3) The permanent, legalized influence of the crown both on the appointment of the officials and the progress of the trials. It is owing to the great power which the State wielded in this institution that executions were far more numerous in Spain than anywhere else. Again and again the Popes had to remonstrate against the severity of the Spanish Inquisition.

155. Estimate of the Spanish Inquisition — Well-Founded Charges. — (1) The officials of the Inquisition were often tools of the kings. They allowed themselves to be overawed by the throne, or sought their own ends by slavish subserviency, and thus committed gross violations of justice.

(2) The decrees of Rome protesting against excesses, punishing officials who abused their power, annulling sentences passed in Spain, ordering trials to be transferred to Rome, were too often ignored by the Spanish court. It happened at times that papal letters addressed to the Inquisitors were intercepted by Spanish ministers and never reached their destination.

(3) The clause especially, which assigned the property of the condemned to the royal treasury caused great hardship and led to the condemnation of innocent persons. In the earlier stages of the Inquisition private charity endeavored to mitigate this hardship; later the king or the Inquisition itself took care of the children. This confiscation clause did not apply to the Moriscos.

156. Misrepresentations and Calumnies. — a. Llorente's enormous number of executions — 10,220 between 1481 and 1498 — was obtained by him through a frivolous calculation of probabilities not only lacking positive data, but refuted by his own facts. All contemporary evidence points to about 2,000 executions in the whole of Spain between 1481 and 1505. Instead of Llorente's 22,112 there were only 2,000 executions the next 300 years from 1505 to 1820.

b. The popular idea of Autos-da-fé and Sanbenitos is radically false. The Autos-da-fé (acts of faith) consisted in the solemn liberation of those who had been falsely accused and in the public reconciliation of penitents with the Church. No stake was connected with these ceremonies. The Sanbenito (saccus benedictus) was a penitential garment not more dishonoring than the penance itself. Obstinate heretics who refused to be reconciled were remanded to the secular arm and executed at another time and place.

c. St. Peter Arbuès, the first Inquisitor of Aragon, is represented by the school of history and art (Kaulbach's painting) that chiefly deals in myths, as an old hoary-headed tyrant, a monster of cruelty and rapacity, whose death-sentences depopulated whole districts of Aragon. The mildest charge estimates his victims at 2,000. The following are the historical facts: St. Peter Arbuès, a doctor of the University of Huesca and canon of Saragossa, was a man universally esteemed and beloved for his extraordinary humility, piety, eloquence and charity to the poor. When in 1484 the Inquisition was introduced in Aragon, he was, much against his will, appointed one of the Inquisitors of Saragossa. What is certain is that during his administration one person was *sentenced* to death, and another arrested. What is probable, though unsupported by contemporary evidence, is that *a few* suffered the penalties of the law at the hands of the tribunal of which he

was an officer. Llorente himself does not state more. To intimidate the tribunal, the Maraños of Aragon, in a secret conspiracy, collected 10,000 reals for the murder of Peter Arbuès and three other officers of the Inquisition. The saint fe'l at the altar of his church beneath the daggers of the hired assassins in 1485, at the age of forty-two, and after one year's administration. He was beatified, after due proof of miracles wrought at his tomb, in 1664, and canonized by Pius IX. in 1867.

(d) The Spanish Inquisition was not an unpopular institution, the contrary is true. If at times it met opposition, it was not the people but the nobility and the higher clergy that objected to it on account of its restricting their ordinary jurisdiction.

(e) Nothing is more incorrect than to ascribe the decadence of Spanish learning and civilization to the Inquisition. The golden age of Spanish poetry, learning and culture coincides with the period of its greatest activity. Both culture and Inquisition went down before the shallow rationalism imported from revolutionary France.

(f) It is not just to compare the judicial methods of the Inquisition with those of the present day. They must be compared with contemporary procedures sanctioned by the public laws. The methods which we deplore in the Inquisition were methods of the age; the redeeming qualities were peculiar to the institution. At the bar of the Inquisition the accused had ample time and means to prepare his defense. He was given an attorney who was under oath faithfully to defend his client. Besides two priests who had no connection with the Inquisition, were bound to protect the accused against arbitrary ruling, to inspect *all* the records twice, and to report to the authorities. The accused had the right of summoning witnesses in his favor from the remotest region, even from beyond the sea. Not so in the criminal courts of England and elsewhere. There both the charges and the accusers were concealed from the prisoner until his actual appearance in the court. He was not allowed an advocate, nor could he bring forward witnesses in his defense.

(g) The punishment of fire was neither introduced by the Church, nor confined to the Inquisition, nor the severest mode of execution employed by our far sterner and harsher ancestors. It was the punishment for high treason in the case of a woman in England, for poisoning and other civil crimes in France, for circulating base coin in the Empire. The process of being drawn, hanged, disemboweled and quartered for high treason in England, the boiling to death of prisoners under Henry VIII., the revolting punishment of the wheel, on which the criminal was left to linger with broken bones for hours and days in Germany and France, were worse than the stake.

Finally it is worthy of notice that Spain owes to the Inquisition the preservation of the Catholic faith, the acquisition of national and civil unity, and an unbroken internal peace at the time when, in consequence of the Protestant Revolution, nearly all the countries of Europe were suffering and bleeding under the curse of civil and religious wars.

157. **The Holy Office.** — The last form of the Inquisition is the Congregation of the Roman and Universal Inquisition, founded by Paul III., in 1542. It is a congregation of Cardinals under the presidency of the Pope himself, organized to watch over the purity of the Catholic faith, in matters of heresy, schism or other crimes concerning religion, not only in the city of Rome but in the entire Catholic world. Its jurisdiction extends over all the faithful including the highest prelates. The Cardinals alone are exempt. Its chief functions are the settling of religious controversies and the approbation or condemnation of books concerning religious matters (Index).

Hefele-Dalton: *The Life of Cardinal Ximenes.* — Gams, O. S. B.: *Die Spanische Staatsinquisition; Die Kirchengeschichte von Spanien*, vol. 3, p. 2, pp. 5–93; *Petrus Arbuès*, ibid., pp. 23–43. — Juan Antonio Llorente: *Hist. critique de l'inquisition d'Espagne.* — Llorente: *The Spanish Inquisition.* — Right Rev. J. Dwenger: *The Spanish Inquisition.* — J. de Maistre: *Letters on the Spanish Inquisition.* — Reuss: *Sammlung der Instructionen des Spanischen Inquisitions gerichtes.* — Dr. M. Lederer: *Der Span. Cardinal Torquemada.* — Bloetzer, S. J.: *Inquisition, Staatslexicon*, vol. 3, p. 423. — *Inquisition: Herder's Kirchenlexicon.* — A. J. Christie: *The Inquisition*, M. '83, 3, p. 82. — R. S. Smith: *The Spanish Inquisition*, M. '92, 1, p. 375 (also in *Historical Papers*, ed. by John Mor. is, S. J., and C. T. P. S., no. 19). — J. G. S.: *The Inquisition*, A. C. Q., v. 1, p. 254. — Grisar: *On the Spanish Inquisition*, I. K. Z., '79, pp. 548–578. — H. P. B.: *Cardinal Ximenes: Würdigung der Inquisition*, vol. 19, p. 493; *Peter Arbuès*, vol. 60, p. 854; Knöpfler. *On the Inquisition* (ag. Grisar), vol. 90, p. 165. — *On the Inquisition and its Literature*, H. J.-B., v. 11, p. 302. — See also *Church Histories.*

§ 2.

UNIVERSITIES.

158. **Foundation.** — The greatest number of the Universities were founded during this period. The new Universities, unlike the earlier ones (see Vol. I., No. 591) were based on charters issued by the Pope, by the Emperor or by territorial princes. The latter foundations, however, had to be confirmed by papal or imperial charters. Copies of letters of erection issued either at the Pontiff's own impulse or at the request of spiritual or temporal princes, are still extant in the case of 27 universities *founded between* 1303 and 1489.

The faculties of Universities founded by rulers and statesmen could not be fully organized without papal approval. The Popes materially supported the Universities by granting benefices to the holders of professors' chairs, devoting enormous sums of money to the maintenance and advancement of studies, founding colleges, enriching them with privileges, defending the immunities of the University against encroachments of civic magistrates, settling differences arising between the natives and the foreigners, or the "townsmen and the gownsmen," and by ardently co-operating in every effort that was made to instruct and enlighten.

159. Organization. — Both professors and students were divided into nations. Thus Paris had its French, Picardic, Norman and English nations. Curiously enough the French nation included Italians, Spaniards, Portuguese, Greeks and Orientals, the English nation Scotchmen, Irishmen, Germans, Poles and Scandinavians. Bologna had its Citramontanes and Ultramontanes, Padua its Cisalpines and Transalpines. In Oxford the students were divided into Northern men and Southern men. Prague had its Bohemian, Bavarian, Saxon and Polish nations. But the German nations, 20,000 professors and students, left Prague and founded the University of Leipsic, when John Hus made the University a centre of Czech-national and anti-Catholic agitation. At the head of the nations stood the Proctors (Procuratores). The chief faculties were theology, jurisprudence, medicine and philosophy, the latter including the liberal arts. Bologna added a fifth faculty by treating the Roman and the Canon laws as separate branches. Each faculty was headed by a Dean. As the faculty of arts, being the indispensable preparation for the three higher faculties, was by far the most numerous, the Rector of this faculty in the fourteenth century displaced the earlier Chancellor as the highest functionary of the University. The artistic or philosophical faculty usually numbered 25–30 professors, theology and law each 3–6 teaching doctors, whilst the medical faculty rarely had more than two lecturing doctors. The M. A.'s were simultaneously teachers in the lower and students in the higher faculties. All persons who belonged to the corporation of the University, not only professors and students but copyists, bookbinders, merchants authorized to deal with the University, were recorded in a list (matricula, matriculation, almae matri adscripti) and thereby subject to the jurisdiction of the Rector, who was the ordinary judge in civil and criminal matters. The Rector was elected every two years. He was accorded precedence over Archbishops and even Cardinals and was assisted by a number of proctors and deans.

160. Colleges and Burses. — The College system owed its origin partly to the law which forbade students to board with private families unless they were relatives, and partly to the enlightened charity of the Middle Ages ever ready to assist poor scholars. The colleges were buildings endowed by the Church, by princes or private benefactors. They contained both lecture halls for instruction, and living and dining-rooms for professors and students. One of the first and the most famous college, the Sorbonne at Paris, was founded by Robert de Sorbon, the confessor of St. Louis IX. The Sorbonne became the model for other colleges in France, England and Italy. The college system of Bologna was developed chiefly by ecclesiastics. The Collegio Bresciano was founded by William of Brescia, archdeacon of Bologna, the Spanish college by the celebrated soldier-Cardinal Albornoz (see No. 20), the Collegium Gregorianum by Gregory XI. The seventeen colleges of Oxford either bore the names of their founders (King's, founded by Henry VI., Queen's, founded by the queens of Henry VI. and Edward IV.),

or were designated by sacred titles (St. Peter's, Corpus Christi, Christ College, Trinity Hall, etc.). Whilst the plan is much the same in all, they were independent of one another. The colleges were managed by Masters or "Heads" who with certain graduates called Fellows constituted the *college* corporation and administered the rich funds at their disposal. The whole body of the colleges taken together formed the University. Instead of colleges the German Universities had Burses (bursa — purse, hence the students' name Burschen). The buildings maintained by the burses were exclusively residences, and furnished the students with board and lodging on various terms. All the lectures were held in the one University building. Poor students were everywhere admitted free to college or burse.

161. **Studies and Examinations.**— The yearly lectures usually began October 19 or 20. The lectures were supplemented by repetitions and "disputations" or debates. In many Universities the disputations were held daily after the close of the lectures. In solemn disputations the entire faculty was present. The first examination in logic, rhetoric and grammar took place at the end of a two years' course and made the candidate a bachelor of arts (B. A.). Success in a further course of two years in philosophy, mathematics, physics and astronomy entitled the student to mastership of arts (M. A.). The title "doctor," the highest dignity of authorized teachers, was originally confined to the jurists (LL.D.), and later extended to philosophy, theology and medicine (Ph. D., D.D., M. D.). A candidate of theology upon passing an examination in Holy Writ and the great scholastic systems of the Middle Ages, was first declared a licensed teacher (licentiatus) before he was raised to the doctorate, usually conferred with great solemnity in the cathedral or principal church of the University town.

162. **Drawbacks of the University System.**— With the great increase in the number of Universities the attendance at individual schools naturally decreased, although the Universities retained their international and cosmopolitan character down to the Protestant Revolution. Oxford may serve as a case in point. Whilst in 1231 the University of Oxford numbered 30,000 members, a hundred and twenty or thirty years later, the numbers were 4,000 and 6,000. The Black Death, however, and the Hundred Years War also contributed to the decrease. There were other and real drawbacks connected with the growth of the University System. The great cathedral and monastic schools of former periods were forced out of existence by the monopoly. The ecclesiastical seminaries, so necessary for the education of the clergy, ceased to exist in the fourteenth century. Celebrated professors, clergymen and monks flocked to the great centres of learning, and were more or less affected by the whirl and license reigning among the most numerous class of students pursuing the study of the liberal arts. The meeting of thousands of young men of every nationality in the University towns led to frequent broils and riots and regular street battles either

between opposing factions or between students and guilds or other town folks. The extraordinary prestige which the University doctors enjoyed not only in scientific, but in ecclesiastical and political affairs as well, engendered a class pride which in the Conciliar Movement well-nigh endangered the constitution of the Church. Besides, the depth and solidity of doctrine which had been the pride of the earlier Universities and the great monastic doctors, gradually gave way to the treatment of trivial questions and logical quibbles. Instead of original works commentaries were multiplied. The text of the Bible and the works of the great scholastics almost disappeared under a layer of interpretations and enlargements. English theologians alone contributed 160 commentaries on the "Sentences" of Peter Lombard. (See Vol. I., No. 593.) Thus the philosophical and sacred sciences became the butt for the ridicule of the "Humanists," and opened the door to the revival of heathenism by the radical school of the Renaissance.

Cardinal Newman: *The Idea of a University; Office and Work of Universities; Mediaeval Oxford.*— F. Denifle: *Die Universitäten des Mittelalters; Cartularium Universitatis Parisiensis.*— H. Rashdall: *The Universities of the Middle Ages.*— Drane: *Christian Schools and Scholars.*— F. C. Lavigny: *The Universities of the M. A.* (*Barnard's Am. Journal of Education*, v. 22).—A. Zimmerman, S. J.: *Die Universitäten Englands im 16ten Jahrhundert.*— Huber: *English Universities*, ed. by F. Newman.— L'Abbé P. Feret: *Hist. de la Faculté de Theologie a l'Université de Paris.*— Anth. F. Wood: *City of Oxford* (Oxf. Hist. Soc).— C. G. Little: *The Grey Friars in Oxford* (Oxf. Hist. Soc.).— J. B. Mullinger: *A Hist. of the University of Cambridge.*— Budwiski: *Die Universität Paris und die Fremden an derselben im Mittelalter.*— J. F. Hogan: *The Popes as Promoters of University Education*, D. R. '94, 2, p. 278.— J. B. Milburn: *The Church and the Universities: Bologna and Paris*, D. R. '98, 2, p. 65; *Oxford*, ibid., '99, 2, p. 314.— *The Ancient Faculty of Paris*, M., v. 3, p. 303 (old series).— *Mediaeval Universities:* Q. R. '96, 2, p. 445.— Holland: *The Origin of the University of Oxford:* E. H. R., v. 6, p. 238.— G. B. Lancaster: *The Friars in Oxford:* D. R. '93, 1, p. 84.— A. Herbert: *Edmund of Abingdon and the Universities:* D. R, '98, 3, p. 107.— Oerterer: *Zur Gesch. d. Universitäten im Mittelalter*, H. P. B., v. 13, pp. 86–561.— Hoeber: *Universitäten: Staatslexicon*, vol. 5, pp. 802–828.— J. Janssen: *Hist. of the German People: The Universities and Other Centers of Learning*, vol. 1. pp. 86–163.

§ 3.

THE RENAISSANCE.

163. Causes and Origin. — The Renaissance, which from Italy spread over the greater part of Western Europe in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, was a revival of classical antiquity in learning, art, law, politics and life. The external events which gave rise to the Renaissance were the increasing influx of Greek scholars visiting the councils of Pisa, Constance, Basel and Ferrara-Florence. Three Eastern Emperors in succession journeyed to the western world to obtain aid against the Turks, Palaeologus, Manuel and John, Manuel even as far as England (1408). The fall of Constantinople with its

dispersion of educated Hellenists, gave a fresh impulse to the study of antique art and literature. The importation of numerous Greek manuscripts vastly increased the knowledge of classical antiquity, whilst the search for and discovery in European libraries of Latin authors unknown heretofore, yielded a rich harvest. Greek scholars of eminence, such as Chalcocondylas, Andronicus, Constantine and John Lascaris, quickly made the schools of Italy famous by their teaching, and attracted students from all parts of Europe to Rome, Florence and Naples, and other Italian centres of the new learning. This Renaissance of literature was called Humanism, and its votaries Humanists, or, more frequently, Poets. A twofold tendency is clearly discernible in the gifted founders of the movement, Petrarch and Boccaccio. Dante had closed the period of mediaeval poetry, and had summed up in his Divina Comedia, the grandest monument of Catholic genius, what was greatest and noblest in the conceptions of the Middle Ages. Petrarch, striking out new paths, combined in his sonnets enthusiasm for classical learning with devout reverence for Christianity. He was Catholic in his principles, pure in his sonnets, but pagan in his love of glory. The Decameron and other writings of Boccaccio breathe an atmosphere of pagan corruption and coarsest cynicism, although the author was never an infidel or enemy of the Church. These two tendencies were gradually represented by two distinct schools, the conservative, or Christian, and the radical, or pagan, Renaissance. The former cultivated classical learning and style in support of religion and Christianity; the latter adopted not only the style, but the maxims and feelings, the immorality and the crimes of heathen civilization. The gratification of the senses and the cultivation of literary taste were the prime objects pursued by the voluptuaries of this school.

164. The Radical School of Humanism. — Whilst the earliest Humanists declaimed in the purest Latin on Brutus and Cassius and similar topics, their successors translated the declamations into facts. Three students of Humanism murdered the Milanese duke Galeazzo Visconti. Pietro Paulo Boscoli conspired with others to murder three members of the house of Medici, and succeeded in the case of Giuliano. Stephano Porcaro hatched a plot to kill Nicholas V. at the altar, to seize the 700,000 ducats of the treasury, and to establish a classical republic on the ruins of the government. Lorenzo Valla in his earlier career called on the Romans to drive the Pope

from his capital. Without directly attacking Christianity the Poets despised it as intellectual weakness. They went to ridiculous lengths in expressing their homage to their literary idols. Marsilio Ficino, who in the days of Lorenzo de' Medici divided the honors of learning with Pico de Mirandola and Angelo Poliziano, kept a lamp burning day and night before the bust of Plato, and celebrated the days of his birth and death with banquets and songs. Pomponius Laetus, the founder of a Humanist Academy in Rome, adored the genius of the ancient city as his deity, and kept his memorial days with high festivities. Lorenzo de' Medici himself, whose carnival songs and carnival licenses corrupted the Florentine youth, and roused Savonarola's burning indignation, barely escaped the daggers of his fellow poets.

165. The Revival in England. — The radical school of the Renaissance which obscured or obliterated Christian sentiments and Christian ideals in Italy never found its way to England. The chief character of the revival in England was the systematic study of the Greek classics and of the Greek Fathers. For although the writings of Chaucer and a few other poets of the early English period of literature show unmistakable traces of Petrarch's and Boccaccio's influence (Decameron and Canterbury Tales), they left no school behind them. The pioneers, who transplanted the new learning from Italian to English soil, were the two monks of Christ Church, William Selling and William Hadley. Both had studied under the most celebrated teachers of Padua, Bologna and Rome. Selling introduced the systematic study of Greek at Oxford. They were followed by the two ecclesiastics, Grocyn and Linacre. Linacre, the disciple of Selling, had enjoyed the privilege of studying with the future Pope Leo X., under Angelo Poliziano, in the household of Lorenzo de' Medici. Grocyn, who had also obtained an Italian schooling, became the teacher in Greek of Thomas More and Erasmus at Exeter College, Oxford. Owing to its conservative character, the revival of learning found but slight opposition in England, and what there existed was easily subdued by the influence of the leading churchmen and of Thomas More who was a power among the scholars of his time. Cardinal Wolsey, the chief ecclesiastic of the day, the pious Warham, Archbishop of Canterbury, the saintly Fisher, bishop of Rochester, Langton, bishop of Winchester, and Dean Colet, were not only ardent humanists but thorough and practical churchmen. Thus the great successes achieved by the two English Universities in

the cultivation of classical learning was chiefly due to the co-operation and protection of the Church.

The current assumption that the freedom of thought due to England's apostasy from Rome gave rise to the revival of letters, is as groundless as the assertion that the attitude of the Church was one of hostility to letters and learning. Both fictions are based on a strange misapprehension or misrepresentation of the term "New Learning." This term in contemporary writers did not signify the *Renaissance* of letters but the new *heresies* of Luther and other continental reformers, to which the Church was of necessity opposed. The most strenuous advocates of classical learning, men like Fisher and More, were uncompromising opponents of the "New Learning," in the sense of Lutheranism. As a matter of fact, the decay of scholarship, the disappearance of Greek studies, the wholesale destruction of the great libraries of England, and the extinction of the Renaissance, were the direct outcome of the Protestant Revolution.

166. The Earlier Humanists in Germany. — In Germany the earlier Humanists worked for the revival of learning in all branches of knowledge and for a more enlightened system of education, but they remained staunch supporters of the Church and never allowed their culture to lead them beyond the limit of Catholic teaching and practice.

The fathers of German Humanism were the three pupils of Thomas a Kempis, Rudolf Agricola, called a second Virgil, at Heidelberg and Worms (d. 1485), Alexander Hegius, rector of the Deventer school (d. 1498) and Rudolf of Langen at the cathedral school of Münster (d. 1519). Jacob Wimpheling, "the Educator of Germany," won universal renown for his grammatical, rhetorical and educational writings and labors. Dr. John Eck, the sturdy opponent of Luther, added to his vast classical erudition a profound knowledge of theology. Abbot Tritheim founded the Rhenish Literary Society, corresponded with all the learned men of Europe, and received with generous hospitality princes, nobles, prelates and scholars who came to see him on learned subjects or to study in his rich library. John of Dalberg, bishop of Worms and chancellor of the University of Heidelberg stood at the head of a "Literary Sodality" comprising all Germany. In Nuremberg and Augsburg, the centres of Humanism in southern Germany, the patricians Pirkheimer and Peutinger gathered around them the elite of learned men. Among the great number of nuns and educated women the Nüremberg abbess, Charitas Pirkheimer, occupied the foremost rank. In these circles not only classical literature was studied, but national poetry, history and antiquities, natural sciences, especially astronomy (Regiomontanus). At Strassburg Sebastian Brant wrote his "Ship of Fools," the

greatest German literary work of the fifteenth century. To these men are due the development of the mother tongue, and the years of intense intellectual activity which preceded the Protestant Revolution.

167. The Younger Humanists. — Fundamentally different from the above mentioned school were the younger or radical Humanists. Wanton attacks upon the Holy See, the Religious Orders, Catholic doctrines and practices, contempt for the whole learning of the Middle Ages and for their own mother tongue, and a worse than pagan immorality in their writings characterize the great majority of this school of "Poets."

Its founder and chief representative was Erasmus of Rotterdam. "The extent and variety of his knowledge in almost every branch of contemporary learning, his untiring activity in all directions, his consummate mastery and artistic treatment of the Latin language, and the variety and richness of his style were equaled by few." He brought forth fresh editions of the Bible, of the Greek classics and Fathers, and original treatises in every branch of literature. But whilst "he handled with masterly skill the weapons of scorn, irony and malicious satire, he was altogether wanting in intellectual depth." He traveled through England, Italy and France as a mere book worm without eye or understanding for national life and character. His unblushing vanity, his moral versatality which made him retain the friendship of More and Fisher in England whilst it made him the idol of the vilest poets in Germany, his freedom in the use of calumny, his talent for fulsome flattery to obtain money and presents, matched only by his malignant spite against adversaries, destroyed all proportion between his literary achievements and his character. The chief followers of his school who, when not fighting the theologians, devoted their energies to the composition of vapid verses and lewd poems, were Conrad Celtes, Eobanus Hesse, the "mighty toper," Crotus Rubianus, Conrad Rufus Mutian, the dissolute Ulric of Hutten, the knight-errant of Humanism, and a host of minor scribblers. In their school work they read the most profligate pagan poetry with their young pupils and introduced a reign of unrestrained license at Erfurt and other universities and schools.

168 Humanism in France and Spain. — In France William Budaeus (1467–1540) and Dionysius Lambinus (1516–1572) represented the conservative, the grostesque satirist, Francis Rabelais, the radical school of Humanism.— In Spain, foremost in position, learning and influence was Cardinal Ximenes (1436–1517), Archbishop of Toledo, the founder of the University of Alcala, and originator of the Polyglot Bible of Complutum (ancient name for Alcala). This work in which the sacred text is given in six versions,

was executed after the plan and at the expense of the great Cardinal. Other Spanish Humanists were Anthony of Lebrija and Louis Vives, of Valencia, the tutor of princess Mary Tudor.

169. The Church and Humanism.— Three Humanists mounted the papal chair in the fifteenth and the beginning of the sixteenth century: Nicholas V., the founder of the Vatican library; Pius II., celebrated as orator, poet, historian and manuscript collector, and Leo X., brought up in the new learning at his Medicean home of Florence. Calixt III. was cold, Paul II. hostile, Sixtus IV. friendly, the successors of Sixtus IV. indifferent to the Humanists. The attacks of the Poets upon monks, friars and theologians naturally enough called forth counter attacks in which individual scholastics overstepped the limits of prudence by assailing not only the excesses but the movement itself. This literary warfare became most bitter in Germany.

A controversy about Jewish literature, which broke out in the beginning of the sixteenth century between John Reuchlin and John Pfeffercorn led to disastrous results. John Reuchlin, with Erasmus the most learned of the later humanists, had earned great and deserved renown by reviving the knowledge of Hebrew in Germany. He wished to save the Jewish books which were not open libels against the Church, whilst his opponent Pfeffercorn, a converted Jew, backed by the Dominicans of Koeln, worked for the destruction by imperial decree, of all Jewish books opposed to the Church. The real point in question was soon lost sight of in the general controversy between Scholasticism and Humanism to which the original dispute gave rise. The most infamous literary product of this pen-war were the *Epistolae obscurorum virorum* (Letters of obscure men), replete with slander, impiety and blasphemy, published 1515–1517, by Crotus Rubianus and Ulrich of Hutten. Erasmus had no share in their composition, but he must be considered the spiritual father of the concoction, by his "Praise of Folly" a satire which was extensively utilized by the authors of the Letters. The controversy greatly promoted the Lutheran movement which began a few years later, and drove nearly all the Humanists, for a time at least, into the ranks of the Augustinian of Wittenberg.

170. Invention of Printing.—Humanism, like all other literary undertakings, was powerfully promoted by the art of printing with movable types. The three men who co-operated in this invention were John Gutenberg of Mainz, the actual inventor, Faust, his financial

supporter, and the copyist Schoeffer, Gutenberg's talented assistant. The invention and development of the art fell in the period between 1450 and 1456, in which year the first complete Latin Bible was printed. From Mainz and Strasburg, the art spread over all Germany and Europe. Schoeffer established the art at Paris, 1475, Caxton at London, 1477. It found its way to Hungary, 1473, to Denmark, 1482, to Constantinople, 1490. Spain, where Columbus for a time belonged to the printing trade, had over thirty printing establishments at the end of the century, Italy 100 outside of Rome, and Rome alone 190. Frankfort-on-the-Main became the centre of the world's book trade. The chief works issuing from the newly invented press were: (1) Bibles. In 1479 appeared the first German Bible; fifteen German versions were published at Nüremberg, and nine others at Basel before the end of the century, whilst the Vulgate or standard Latin Bible went through 100 editions during the same period. (2) Editions of the Latin and Greek Fathers. (3) Latin and Greek classics, of which the Aldine editions of Venice reached the widest renown. (4) The works of the Humanists. (5) Innumerable devotional books and leaflets. Thomas à Kempis' Imitation of Christ, alone, translated into different languages, reached 59 editions down to the year 1500.

The charge, that on the one hand the people clamored for the English Bible, and, on the other hand, the Church maintained a hostile attitude towards an English version, is not supported by facts. It is directly based on the condemnation and destruction by Archbishop Arundel of Tyndale's translation. Thomas More, a contemporary witness of unexceptional authority, tells us that no general prohibition of the English Bible existed, nor was there any law whatever which forbade the possession, examination, or reading of the Holy Scriptures in English. Wyclif's and Tyndale's versions were prohibited because they contained heretical corruptions of the text. Tyndale's Testament was very commonly known as Luther's Testament, and contained over 2,000 text corruptions. The whole Bible, long before Wyclif, was translated into the English tongue. "I, myself," says More, "have seen and can show you Bibles, fair and old, written in English, which have been known and seen by the bishop of the diocese, and left in the hands of laymen and women whom he knew to be good and Catholic people who used the books with devotion and soberness." To say that the English people clamored for the English version is to mistake the character of the time. Nearly one half of the population could not read. The price of Tyndale's version printed abroad was beyond the poorer classes. When Henry VIII. broke with the

Church, the people, far from clamoring for the new version, had to be forced by numerous royal proclamations and penal enactments to purchase copies.

Pastor-Antrobus: *Hist. of the Popes; The Literary Renaissance in Italy and the Church;* Introduction to vol. 1 and vol. 5; *under Martin V.*, vol. 1, p. 256; *under Eugene IV., ibid*, p. 303; *Nicholas V. as Patron of the Renaissance*, vol. 2, p. 165; *The Conspiracy of Stephano Porcaro*, p. 215; *under Pius II.*, vol. 3, p. 301; *Paul II. and the Renaissance*, vol. 4, p. 36; *Sixtus IV.*, etc., v. 4, p. 432; *Innocent VIII. as Patron of Art and Scholarship*, vol. 5, p. 322; *Alexander VI.*, etc., vol. 6, p. 165. — Creighton: *Popes*, passim. — Ch. Daniel: *Les Etudes classiques dans la société chrétienne.* — W. S. Lilly: *The Renaissance* (Chapters on European Hist.). — J. Burkhardt: *Hist. of the Renaissance in Italy.* — W. H. Kent: *Renaissance*, D. R. '99, 3, p. 1. — *Two Views of the Renaissance*, M. '86, 3, p. 22. — Reumont: *Literatur und Kunst des 15ten Jahrhundts: Rom.* v. 3, pp. 287–471. — G. Voigt: *Die Wiederbelebung des classischen Alterthumes.* — F. A. Gasquet: *The Eve of the Reformation; The Revival of Learning in England; Erasmus; The Printed English Bible*, pp. 14–90, 155–207, 236–277. — R. Parsons: *Erasmus; Studies*, vol. 3, p. 334. — J. M. Stone: *Aspects of the Renaissance; Erasmus: The Old and the New Learning*, M. '96, 2, p. 546; 3, p. 98. — M. Creighton: *The Early Renaissance in England.* — Green: *The Revival of Learning* (Hist. of the Engl. People, bk. 5, ch. 2). — Joh. Janssen: *History of the German People at the Close of the M. A.* (Transl. by Mitchell and Christie); *The Spread of the Art of Printing — The Older Humanists*, vol. 1, pp. 9–85; *The Later Humanism*, vol. 3, pp. 1–79. — H. N. Humphrey: *Hist. of the Art of Printing.* — Mrs. Oliphant: *The Makers of Venice*, part 4, ch. 3 (to the Aldine Press). — C. Knight: *Wm. Caxton.* — Falkenstein: *Gesch. der Buchdruckerkunst.* — A. v. d. Linde: *Gesch. der Erfindung der Buchdruckerkunst.* — F. Falk: *Die Druckkunst im Dienste der Kirche.*

§ 4.

RENAISSANCE OF ART AND POLITICS.

171. Renaissance of Art — Painting. — Two schools of painting preceded the Renaissance, the *Byzantine* and the *Roman*. The Byzantine, chiefly represented at Venice, conceived Jesus as he is described by the prophet, "without form or comeliness." Its human figures in general were stiff and conventional. The Roman school was founded by Cimabue (1240–1302) and his greater pupil Giotto, the contemporary of Dante (1276–1337). This school shook off the Byzantine traditions, studied and idealized nature, introduced the perspective, and prepared the way for the masterpieces of the Renaissance. This new period of art saw the rise of several schools, each distinguished by some master genius. The *Umbrian School* has its Bl. Fra Angelico da Fiesole (1387–1455). His characteristics are the beautiful expression of deep devotion and piety; one of his masterpieces is the "Coronation of Mary," in the Louvre of Paris. The new *Venetian School* glorified in the achievements of Titian (1497–1576) and Paul Veronese. Both were distinguished by the originality and magnificence of their conception and the richness of coloring, in the latter quality Titian was unsurpassed. Titian's works were biblical, historical and portrait painting. He is the founder of landscape painting.

The *Lombard School* was founded by Leonardo da Vinci (1452–1519), a universal genius, who besides being one of the greatest painters of Italy, was

mathematician, anatomist, architect, musician and poet. His greatest work is the "Last Supper," in the refectory of the Dominican convent of Milan. Next in force and beauty is Correggio (1497–1534). His masterpiece, "The Worship of the Magi" is preserved at Dresden.

The *Bolognese School*, founded by the three Caracci, owes its renown to Guido Reni (1575–1642) and Salvator Rosa (1605–1673). The former excelled in the richness and loveliness of composition, the latter in the wildness of his sceneries, peopled with banditti, soldiers and shepherds.

The Tuscan School produced the foremost representatives of the Renaissance of Art, Raphael and Michael Angelo. Raphael's true genius, as expressed in most of his Madonnas, was an instinct for beauty. Some of his best works are the Stanze, or wall paintings in the Vatican, especially the "Disputa," the glorification of the Blessed Sacrament. The gigantic genius of Michael Angelo, "the master of live stone," made him equally prominent as painter, sculptor and architect.

The character of his work is force, grandeur and anatomical correctness. Most renowned among his paintings is the "Last Judgment," in the Sistine Chapel, of his sculptures David and Moses, of his architectural work the dome of St. Peter.

172. Outside of Italy. — Italy was not the only country that produced masterpieces in the new art. Spain had its Velasquez de Silva, a portrait painter of extraordinary power (1599–1660), and the greater Murillo (1618–1682), who united grace, force and sublimity with exquisite coloration, and whose "Immaculate Conception" vies with the beauty of the greatest Italian paintings. Rubens (1577–1640) the chief master of the Flemish school, possessed many of Murillo's traits but lacked his deep religious feeling.

The French artists, prominent among them the landscape painter Claude Lorraine (1600–1682), mostly followed Italian models, whilst in the Netherlands the Van Eyks (1366–1440), in Germany Albrecht Dürer (1471–1528) and Hans Holbein (d. 1543), and in Holland the great Rembrandt (1607–1669) renowned for his magical light and shade effects (chiaro-oscuro), struck out independent paths of their own.

173. Architecture — Christian architecture borrowed its materials and technical construction from the Roman buildings, modifying them according to the needs of divine service. Of the chief forms of religious architecture, (a) the Basilica style was the most ancient. The inside space rising from the oblong ground form was divided by two, four or six rows of columns into three, five or seven naves and concluded at the altar end by a semicircular apse. (St. Paul's basilica in Rome). — (b) The Cupola style, in which a central dome rises on pillars from a square or cruciform ground plan. (Hagia Sophia in Constantinople). Italian artists brought this style to Russia (1462), where it was corrupted by Tartar admixtures and a senseless multiplication of domes. — (c) In the Roman style the ground plan is the Latin cross; its

characteristic, the round arch. The square formed by the crossing of the two arms is often crowned by a dome. Square towers flank the main portal. It flourished from about 1100 to 1250, with a gradual transition from the round to the pointed arch. (Cathedrals of Mainz, Worms and Speier). — (d) The Gothic style with its pointed arch, the predominance of the vertical line, and the rising on high of all its parts, has carried vault building to its highest perfection. Ground plan and position of towers are taken from the Roman style, but the presbytery is enlarged and closes with an octagon or dodecagon frequently forming a crown of side chapels. In its strict and simple form belonging to the 13th century it was transplanted from France (Rheims, Amiens), to the Netherlands (Brussels, Antwerp), England (Salisbury, Exeter), and Germany (Trier, Marburg). The richer style of the fourteenth century was developed chiefly in Germany (Koeln, Strassburg). The sixteenth century brought in a degeneration, the flat Tudor arch. The Gothic style with its grandeur and solemnity is the characteristic style of the Middle Ages, the triumph of mind over matter, a standing rebuke of the maligners of the period. The Gothic cathedrals are still the noblest buildings of Europe. It took centuries to build them. All classes of the people from the richest to the poorest vied with each other to contribute to their erection by gifts of money, material, plate, jewelry or voluntary work.

(e) The Renaissance style of architecture returned to antique forms. It loves wide spaces, spans the ceiling with a vault of cylindrical shape, and uses the column not for support but for ornamentation. San Lorenzo of Florence (1425) became the model for churches, the Pitti palace for palaces of this style. The Roman Renaissance exhibits richer decorations, employs massive pillars and adds the drum or lantern to the cupola. The greatest work of this school and the largest church of the world is St. Peter's, designed by Bramante and crowned with the dome of Michael Angelo, while the Roman Chancellery may serve as the model for the palace style. The Renaissance style degenerated more quickly than any other. The exaggeration of forms, the prevalency of the spiral line, the multiplying and contortion of limbs led to the absurdities of the Roccocco, especially in France since the reign of Francis I.

174. Mediaeval and Modern Art. — The Renaissance worked a revolution in the very conception of art. From the beginning of the Christian era and throughout the Middle Ages the arts were faithful servants of religion, the books of the poor and unlettered, whereby the doctrine of Christ was explained and spread. The Renaissance made the arts independent, existing for their own beauty and their own ends. As Humanism, so the Renaissance of art has its conservative and radical schools. The latter introduced not only profane but scandalous pictures, statues, ornaments and books of illustration, and ended in making itself the shameless purveyor of the lowest passion. Painters and sculptors seized by the worship of the antique preferred to represent the gods and goddesses of Ancient Greece and treated

them with the pagan freedom which made them so many pitfalls to the unwary. As to architecture, "whilst in Catholic countries, especially in Spain, splendid Gothic work was still done after the Renaissance, ecclesiastical buildings worthy of the name ceased to be erected in Protestant countries; domestic architecture superseded ecclesiastical." In France arose the sumptuous chateau, in England the ancestral homes, but minus the large chapel and the large hall for the exercise of hospitality which in Catholic times had adorned the houses of the nobles, even if the rest of the building was insignificant. An age of utilitarianism set in and held sway ever since, fitly illustrated by the architectonical monsters of modern industrialism. To quote Ruskin, the "pestilent Renaissance has overwhelmed everything artistic."

175. The Renaissance of Law and Statesmanship. — The Renaissance with its one-sided preference for everything classical was chiefly responsible for the supplanting of the freer, customary Teutonic laws by the Roman law with its tendency towards absolute princely power and arbitrary interference in Church affairs. The new counsellors and statesmen of the Renaissance took no interest in the welfare of united Christendom, but inspired and supported the narrow and selfish aims of kings and princes. The doctrine of pagan statesmanship found its chief exponent in Niccolò Macchiavelli (1469–1527), diplomatist, statesman, and from 1489–1512, second chancellor of the Florentine Republic. The fall of the Republic brought him imprisonment and exile to his small estate outside the city. Here he wrote his two chief works, the "Prince," dedicated to Lorenzo II., de Medici and the "Discourses," besides a History of Florence, etc. The principles advocated by Macchiavelli are pagan. The man, he holds, who intends to act morally in all cases is bound to perish in society which cares little for morality. Hence a prince who desires to maintain his position ought to know how to act dishonestly at times when necessity requires it. Everybody grants that it is praiseworthy to keep one's word. But experience proves that princes who cared little for faith and loyalty were most successful and outwitted their more honest opponents. Accordingly a prudent prince need not keep his pledged word against his own interest or when the causes cease which had induced him to pledge it. It is most hurtful to princes always to be devout, faithful, humane, pious and honest, but most useful always to appear so. To secure his life and his power against external foes or internal conspiracies, a prince need not be scrupulous about his means; if he succeeds his means will always be approved by the great crowd. Success is the god of politics, calculating prudence their highest counselor, and any means leading to the desired end permissible without regard to honor or morality.— It is still controverted by some, whether this cynical theory expressed Macchiavelli's conviction or whether it was the sarcasm of a disguised Republican. But it is certain that this kind of pagan statesmanship flourished in the Renaissance period at almost every court of Europe. The fourteenth and

the fifteenth centuries in Italy are known as the age of the Despots. A wave of absolutism rolled over the rest of Europe which in France assumed the form of the tyranny of Louis XI., in Spain the arbitrary rule and unprincipled policy of Ferdinand of Aragon, in England the Tudor despotism culminating in Henry VIII. and Elisabeth, in Germany the petty tyranny of the territorial princes, in the States of the Church the rule of Alexander VI.

Pastor-Antrobus: Popes: *Julius II. and Art*, v. 6, p. 455; *Julius II. and Michael Angelo*, p. 503; *Raphael and the Vatican Stanze*, p. 540.— Janssen: *German People: Art and Popular Literature*, vol. 1, p. 164; *The Holy Roman Empire, etc.*, vol. 2, p. 105; *Introduction of a Foreign Code*, p. 161. — Creighton passim. — J. M. Stone: *Aspects of Renaissance: Transition in Arts*, M. '96, 2, p. 473. — A. F. Rio: *De l'Art Chrétien; Michael Ange et Raphaël.* — Zeller: *Italie et Renaissance* (Politics, Letters, Arts).— Kugler: *Handbuch der Gesch. der Malerei.* — Burkhardt: *Civilization in the Period of the Renaissance.*— Schaff: *Renaissance.*— Geiger: *Renaissance und Humanismus in Italien und Deutschland.*— Champlin-Berenson: *Central Italian Painters of the Renaissance.* — Champlin: *Cyclopedia of Painters and Paintings.* — Clement: *Painters, Sculptors, Architects, Engravers.*— Marchese: *Lives of Painters, Sculptors, etc., of the Order of St. Dominic.*— Heaton: *Masterpieces of Flemish Art.* — *Lives of Raphael*, by Cartwright, Crowe and Cavascaselle; D'Anvers; Grimm; (*Das Leben* R.)— Kuntz (*Life, Work and Times*); Passavant Sweetser (*Artist-Biographies*); Knackfuss; Wolzogen.— Bunnètt: *Lives of Michael Angelo:* Condivi (Trey, Valdek); Clement; Duppa (*Lives of Italian Painters*); Grimm-Bunnètt: Harford; Mrs. Oliphant: *The Makers of Florence;* Perkins (*Tuscan Sculptors*); Springer (*Raffael and Michel Angelo*), Sweetser; Symonds; Wilson.— Ruskin: *Giotto and his Works in Padua, Stones of Venice: First or Byzantine Period; Second or Gothic Period*, vol. 2; *Third or Renaissance Period*, vol. 3; *Lectures on Architecture and Painting; Mornings in Florence*, etc.

§ 5.

MEDIAEVAL GUILDS.

176. Guilds and Their Variety. — The social, industrial and commercial life of mediaeval cities is best reflected in the guilds, which reached their greatest development in this period. The object of the guilds was mutual protection and assistance, spiritual and temporal, and the performance of those religious duties and functions which supplied the sanction for every social bond and convivial gathering. As forerunners of the guilds may be considered the collegia privata of ancient Rome, private voluntary associations for mutual support and burial clubs, or the Scandinavian gylds or annual feasts in honor of pagan divinities, or both these ancient institutions. But it was the influence of the Church which gave them their peculiar character in the Middle Ages. Based as they were on the social charity and brotherly aid, which Catholic teaching and tradition never ceased to inculcate, they fully supplied the wants of

the time in which they flourished, and provided for the various accidents and vicissitudes of life. Fraternal charity and amity, the consolation of the sick and support of the needy, the conduct of funerals, the extirpation of rancor and quarrels, the spiritual advantage of members, and, chief care of all, the welfare of the souls of the dead — in these regards the guild statutes of all countries are alike.

177. Division and Work of the Guilds. — The mediaeval guilds were divided into two classes: Trade and craft guilds, and religious guilds. Purely religious guilds or confraternities were comparatively few. As religion pervaded the whole life of the people and sanctified all works of charity and usefulness, all guilds, whatever their special purpose, prescribed in their statutes the practice of social charity and religious observances.

Thus we find guilds for the relief of poverty, old age and sickness; insurance guilds against loss by fire, flood, robbery, shipwreck; guilds for the repair of roads and bridges; guilds for obtaining work, for defense in lawsuits and for the giving of dowries to females on their marrying or entering a religious house. There were guilds that daily fed the poor on meat, bread, fish and ale, or provided beds for strangers and almshouses for the poor of the place. A guild-merchant at Birmingham kept a house with thirteen beds to lodge poor pilgrims, with a governor of the house and a woman to wash the pilgrims' feet. The guild of Corpus Christi at Cambridge in 1352 founded the House of Scholars of Corpus Christi and the "Blessed Mary of Cambridge." Numerous guilds maintained free schools. Every town in England had a kalendar or clergy guild, whose members provided for free education, kept a public record of events, and had charge of the local libraries. Other guilds were formed to organize sacred or miracle plays or public shows and pageants. The Oberammergau Passion play is a survival of the former, the Mayor's Show in London of the latter. At York a guild of the Lord's Prayer was formed for the purpose of keeping up the miracle play of that name, in which "all manner of sins and vices were held up to scorn, and the virtues were held up to praise." Some of the guilds were semi-military organizations for patroling the streets and for defending the walls and the gates of the towns. Roeskild had a guild for the suppression of piracy. The most renowned, however, of the military guilds was the Holy Brotherhood or Hermandad in Spain, which in 1295 united thirty-four cities in the maintenance of public order and security. In 1315 the Brotherhood comprised 100 cities and under Ferdinand and Isabella the entire kingdoms of Castile and Aragon. On the flight of a criminal the tocsins of the villages

which he was supposed to reach, were sounded and the officers of the brotherhood, stationed on the different points, took up the pursuit with such promptness as left little chance of escape.

178. Religious and Social Feasts and Business Meetings. — The combination of religion with social and industrial life so characteristic of the Middle Ages was especially strong in the guilds. The very statutes drawn up at the foundation of a new guild, breathe the spirit of religious piety. Here an example: "In worship of God Almighty our Creator and His Mother St. Mary, and all Saints, and St. James the Apostle, a fraternity is begun by good men in the church of St. James, at Garlekhit in London, on the day of St. James, the year of our Lord, 1375, for the amendment of their lives and of their souls, and to nourish greater love between the brethren and sisters of the said brotherhood." The guilds charged themselves with the repair of churches and the renovation of vestments, books and other church ornaments, erected altars, placed stained glass windows into the cathedrals and founded masses and chantries. Among the works of religion the burial of the dead took a prominent part; all the guild statutes contain regulations regarding this point. Trentals or successive masses for thirty days and yearly anniversaries were held for deceased members. Alms were distributed among the poor that they too might pray for them. The Sunday rest and the sanctity of the ecclesiastical feasts together with their eves were religiously observed. In nearly all of the guilds a yearly feast on the day of the Patron Saint of the confraternity was kept under a clause of their statutes. The day began by a solemn procession behind their guild banners to the guild church, where a solemn high mass was celebrated.

How everything connected with religious celebrations was strictly regulated, may be seen from an agreement between the city authorities and the guilds of Winchester regarding the Corpus Christi procession of 1435: "It is agreed, that the carpenters and felters shall go together, first; smiths and barbers, second; cooks and butchers, third; shoemakers with two lights, fourth; tanners and japanners, fifth; plumers and silkmen, sixth; fishers and farriers, seventh; taverners, eighth; weavers with two lights, ninth; fullers with two lights, tenth; dyers, with two lights, eleventh; chaundlers and brewers, twelfth; mercers with two lights, thirteenth; the wives with one light and John Blake with another light, fourteenth; and all these lights

shall be borne orderly before the said procession before the priests of the city. And the four lights of the brethren of St. John's shall be borne about the Body of our Lord Jesus Christ, the same day in the procession aforesaid." How much these Catholic guild men thought of their position in the Corpus Christi procession may be judged from the great ten years' strike of the bakers of Colmar. They struck in 1495 and left the city because they had been refused their usual place in the Corpus Christi procession. The case between the baker's guild and the magistrates went from court to court up to the highest imperial tribunal at Frankfort. The strikers were encouraged and assisted by their associates in other cities of the Upper Rhine. The majority of the baker's guild suspended any journeyman who worked for a Colmar employer. The case was decided in 1505, in favor of the strikers, who after paying 166 florins to the city were re-established in all their privileges, and resumed their old position in the Corpus Christi procession.

To return to the annual feast, when the religious services were over, the head or alderman of the guild with its wardens, elders, masterworkers, journeymen and their wives, children and apprentices met in the guild hall for the annual banquet which was followed by outdoor games, pageants and miracle plays.

The numerous accounts preserved throw a good deal of light on the nature and expenses of guild feasts. Thus a London corporation holding its feast on May 3 (Finding of the Holy Cross) used to have 12 priests to sing a Dirge (Requiem) at 4d. each, 12 minstrels who had 2s. 3d. besides their diet and horsemeat. At one of these festivals (1445) they had 6 calves (2s. 2d. each); 16 lambs (12d. each), 80 capons (3d. apiece) 80 geese (2d.), 800 eggs (5d. the 100), and many marrow bones, creame and floure, besides what theyre servants and others brought in. An account of Bologna speaks of "pro malvasia (malmsey) IIII., item for broken glasses."

Besides the yearly feasts there were weekly, monthly or yearly meetings in which officers were elected, accounts credited, new members admitted, appropriations passed for charitable purposes, fines imposed, and members who had disgraced the fraternity excluded. It was on such occasions that the elders passed on the merits of "masterpieces," by which journeymen were raised to the rank of masters.

179. Constitutional Development. — For the most part the liberties of the towns were purchased by the thrifty guilds. By being admitted as a guild member for a year and a day, a serf or bondman became a freeman. The guilds were able and willing to supply

ready money to their rulers, whether they were kings, lords or abbots, in exchange for a parchment which secured them the freedom of trade, justice and government. By means of such charters the guild members obtained the power to hold courts, to judge any thief taken within their jurisdiction, and to hold land by other than the feudal tenure. From guild rights recognized and confirmed by the crown municipal rights developed. In many places the trade guilds became identified with the governing body of the city. In such cases the guild hall became the town hall, the alderman, as the head of the guild was styled, became the magistrate of his ward. Edward II. obliged all burghers to enroll themselves in some guild. Edward IV. transferred the right of election to the civic officers from the original landowners to the guild merchant. Thus rose in London the twelve great companies. From the adoption of a common uniform they were called Livery Companies. The most influential of them, the Grocer's Company (so-called because they *engrossed* all manner of goods) returned sixteen aldermen to the city board. Even the kings entered the great companies as members. Edward III. joined the Clothiers' Company, Henry IV. and VI. the guild of Trinity at Coventry, Henry VIII. in his Catholic days that of St. Barbara. It was in human nature that with growing wealth and influence a class spirit should enter and separate the guilds-merchant from the craft-guilds. The former claimed higher social and political rights, the latter resented their inferiority, and many were the contests, — in England on the whole constitutional — waged between the two classes.

In Germany and on the continent in general, the merchant guilds became more aristocratic and exclusive than in England. Some of the German, Danish and Belgian guilds refused membership to men with dirty hands "or with blue nails" or peddlers crying out their wares in the streets. The patrician or citizen aristocracies which had grown out of the guilds merchant, were often divided among themselves and waging bitter feuds. This gave a chance for the craft guilds to wrest from the guilds merchant some of their exclusive privileges. The struggle was a long and often bloody one. In 1301 ten aldermen of the craft guilds were burnt alive at Magdeburg. In Koeln the Weavers' guild was practically exterminated by the patricians in one of their intramural wars. Thirty-three were executed,

others hunted down in their houses, 1,800 exiled with their families, and their guild houses razed to the ground. But in the end the craft guilds not only obtained equal civic rights, but compelled the patricians to inscribe themselves in the craft guilds in order to qualify for municipal office.

In France the guild rights were feudal grants conferred by the king for money or favor. The superintendence of the various handicrafts devolved on the officers of the royal household, thus the blacksmiths stood under the control of the grand marshal. The "water merchants," conducting the traffic on the Seine formed for a considerable time the civic body of Paris. Unlike in other countries the religious confraternities and the craft guilds were separate organizations, though they were intimately connected. Sometimes several guilds formed but one confraternity, in other cases the members of the same guild, as the goldsmiths of Paris, belonged to different confraternities. In the Italian commonwealth guild life was very strong. In Florence, the "seven arts" represented by the great people (populo grasso) were powerful enough to compel the resident nobles to join their associations as a condition of citizenship. The minor trades exercised by the small people (populo minuto) were innumerable. The woolen manufacture alone supported twenty-five guilds.

180. Some Advantages of the System.— The Catholic guild system of the Middle Ages foresaw and provided against some of the most crying evils of modern industrialism. It was a practical realization of the Christian idea of property which is ownership in the sense of responsible stewardship, whilst the Reformation made it property in the sense of irresponsible ownership. It upheld the true character of the Christian family, as apprentices and journeymen like all other servants were treated as real members of the family. "It united employers and employed in a society bound together by corporate interests, and strong enough at once to control and to defend its members of all classes," instead of arraying them in opposite factions. It excluded the grinding competition of misery, incompetence and low-priced inferiority. Religion, the active principle and bond of union in the guilds, reconciled the conflicting interests of all classes. In trade disputes resort to arbitration by the guild elders was compulsory before going into court. The guild regulations which made every Sunday and festival a holiday, and every Saturday and eve of a festival a half-holiday, and restricted the working hours from morning to the curfew bell in England or the Angelus on the continent, gave all needed rest to the working man, and enabled him to execute artistic work which we may admire but cannot imitate. Under the system all workers became intelligent "artisans," not "hands" performing the functions of a machine. A proletariat or working class of millions that can never rise, did not exist, because all individual workers could aspire to

and reach a master's degree. The chances of rising for the poorest were increased by the fact, that parents however lowly or dependent had the right to send their children to any school or university for *free* education. The town and country guilds had sufficient funds at their disposal to furnish loans by which brethren in distress were enabled to tide over difficulties. These funds were derived from voluntary subscriptions, entrance fees, fines, gifts and legacies, and lands and houses which the guilds held and administered. They thus became the benefit societies of the period, and obviated pauperism in the Middle Ages.

The Protestant Revolution crushed the whole system of guilds and replaced it by the degrading poor-law system and the evils of pauperism as distinguished from honorable poverty.

Toulmin-Smith: *English Gilds; Traditions of the Old Crown House.* — Dr. Brentano: *Essay on Guilds* — *English Guilds: Early Engl. Text. Society.* — Gross: *Guild-Merchant* (Clarendon Press). — Dobson and Harland: *Hist. of Preston Guild.* — J. Malet Lambert: *Two Thouands Years of Gild Life.* — J. Yeats: *Growth and Vicissitudes of Commerce.* — E. P. Cheyney: *English Towns and Guilds* (*Translations and Reprints*, Departm. of Hist. University of Pennsylvania) — Cunningham: *Growth of Engl. Industry and Commerce.* — Ashley: *Engl. Economic Hist.* — E. M. Clerke: *Mediaeval Guilds:* D. R. '90, 3, p. 145. — B. Evetts: *The Lay-Brotherhoods of Sevilla:* M. '93. 1, p. 491. — W. L. Strappini: *English Guilds in the Middle Ages.* M. '93, 3, p. 478. — *On Guilds, Communes, Municipalities* (with Corresp. Literature): E. H. R. v. 8. p. 120. — Beissel, S. J., *Idealer Gehalt der Mittelalt. Handwerksordnung* St. v. 37, p. 257. — *Zunft, Innung: Staatslexicon;* vol. 5, p. 1195. — Green: *Town Life in the Fifteenth Century.*

§ 6.

THE EVE OF THE PROTESTANT REVOLUTION.

181. General Changes. — The eve of the Protestant Revolution was a time replete with new departures, popular unrest and permanent changes. The magnetic needle, probably discovered by the Chinese and used in the nautical compass since the thirteenth century in the East, since the beginning of the fourteenth in the West, materially advanced the discovery of new lands and routes of travel. Whilst the gospel was carried to peoples unknown before, the stories of the returning discoverers stimulated the love of adventure and the greed of gold. Navigation and commerce assumed proportions never dreamt of in earlier times. The introduction of gunpowder in Europe (from China? India? Arabia?) in the middle of the fourteenth century and the gradual improvement of fire-arms changed the condition of warfare, led to the formation of standing armies, destroyed the knight service and chivalry, and aided the

princes to triumph over the lower feudal nobility. The thousands slain in the battles of the Middle Ages were multiplied tenfold. The postal service rapidly spread the news of the stirring times, the ideas, good and evil, of the new learning, and the publications of the youthful press from country to country.

182. General Causes of the Revolution. — The general causes which prepared the way for the apostasy of the sixteenth century may be reduced to the weakening of the bonds of Catholic union and faith in the two preceding centuries. A certain distrust of and antipathy and opposition to the authority of the Holy See, first artificially manufactured by the perfidy of Philip the Fair, received fresh increase by the residence of the Popes at Avignon, the rebellion of Ludwig the Bavarian and the Fraticelli, the deplorable Western Schism, the proclamation and spread of Gallican principles and methods in the Councils of Pisa, Constance and Basel, the Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges, and the German neutrality. Not only princes and university men, but a considerable number of bishops and the people especially in Germany, were drawn into an attitude of suspicion and opposition in which the principles of the divine origin of the Primacy and of its necessity for the welfare of the Church became obscured. While the Renaissance as a general intellectual movement, and especially the conservative school of humanism cannot be made responsible for the defection of the sixteenth century, the general onslaught of the radical school upon the philosophy, theology and monasticism of the Middle Ages, contributed to the confusion of ideas.

This mental attitude was accompanied by a relaxation of morals pervading all classes, both of the laity and clergy, secular and regular, high and low. The simony, nepotism, worldly life, unscrupulous state policy, and scandalous appointments to high places, for which some of the Popes, notably Sixtus IV., and Innocent VIII. were responsible, and the scandals connected with the name of Alexander VI. furnished welcome weapons to diets, princes and agitators, who under the guise of "reform in head and members," pursued their own selfish ends and aimed at nothing less than the secularization of ecclesiastical property and the usurpation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction.

183. **The State of Italy** — It would be a wrong conclusion, however, to say that this corruption was general, and that no effective means were used to stem or mend it. Italy, in the very period of the later Renaissance, was the home of SS. Bernardin of Siena, John Capistran, Jacopo della Marca, Catharine of Bologna, Francis of Paula, Antoninus, Archbishop of Florence, Lorenzo Giustiniani, Patriarch of Venice, Margaret, princess of Savoy, Frances of Rome, and other sainted prelates, missionaries, reformers, and noble ladies. Pastor* furnishes an *incomplete* list of 88 Italian Saints and Beati who died between 1400 and 1520. Even at the time when the College of Cardinals became saturated with worldliness, there were Cardinals who, by their learning, character and piety, were true ornaments to the Church, such as Cardinals Cesarini, Bessarion, Juan Torquemada, Carvajal, Nicholas of Cusa, the saintly Don James, infante of Portugal, and Elias de Bourdeilles, Pedro Gonsalez de Mendoza, and the eminent Francis Ximenes who combined administrative talent and literary culture of the highest order with native simplicity and inflexible morality. A deep conviction of the truth of Catholicity remained a characteristic of the Italian people. Though the spirit of mockery and cynicism, the luxury and moral turpitude, the usury, fraud and passionate gambling accompanying the high material prosperity of Italy, the practice of pagan statecraft and political assassination were to be found at the courts of Naples, Florence, Milan, Venice and of the petty tyrants of the smaller towns, in the palaces of worldly Cardinals and the luxurious homes of the upper classes and in the academies of the pagan humanists, yet much that was good and admirable was preserved amongst the middle classes, the artisans, the people, the classes which were chiefly represented in the guilds. Morality, order, patriotism, genuine piety, self-sacrifice, and tender solicitude for the bringing up of the children were still the rule. No house was without a crucifix or pious picture. Nearly all the larger houses contained a small chapel. Lamps were kept burning before the images of the Madonna in chapels, dwellings and streets. The precepts of the Church, the obligation of Sundays and Holydays and the fasts of the Church were strictly observed. Admirable books on the government of the family (Giovanni Dominici; St. Antoninus), on education (Maffeo Vegio; Baldassare Castiglione), manuals on confession and devotional exercises were widely in use. Nowhere were guilds and confraternities so numerous and fruitful of good works as in Italy. Even Alexander VI. found it prudent to encourage them and to found new ones. A vast treasury of guild hymns, many of them gems of true poetry, sprang up and were sung by the guild members in processions, pilgrimages, in chapel meetings and on street corners when the daily work was finished. The sacred drama or mystery play preserved its religious character throughout the fifteenth century. The most powerful of them, the Roman Passion play, was introduced in the noblest theater of the world, the Coliseum, in 1490. The Renaissance

* History of the Popes, vol. 5, Introduction.

period was also an age of great charity. The foundations in Italy of hospitals, some of them the grandest of the world, of orphanages, foundling asylums, educational institutions for the poor, amounted to 334 between 1399 and 1524. The celebrated Misericordia, the black-hooded burying guild of Florence, faced, from the middle of the thirteenth to the close of the fifteenth century, twenty-five outbreaks of the plague, nursing the sick and burying the dead. The way in which the great Jubilee years of 1450, 1475, and 1500 were observed, afford unmistakable evidence of the spirit of faith, devotion and loyalty to the Church which inspired the masses.

184. **Religious State of Germany.**— In Germany the mixture of good and evil was more threatening to the Church because it was aggravated by political, social and economic abuses. Whilst piety and love of learning still pervaded a great number of the higher and lower, secular and monastic clergy, who were zealous to diffuse religious knowledge by catechetical teaching, sermons, instructive publications and educational work in the elementary and middle schools, too many other churchmen, banqueting, hunting, warfaring and high-living prelates and worldly or ignorant clergymen altogether neglected their sacred duties. The plurality of benefices, the frequent bestowal of ecclesiastical preferments on mere boys or youths not yet ordained, the pernicious rule of appointing younger sons of noble or princely families to the higher and highest posts in the Church, were at the root of the evil. The immense wealth of the Church — the clergy held nearly one-third of the soil — and the large payments made by German prelates to the Roman court, excited the greed of the nobles. The many conflicts between bishops and cities about questions of jurisdiction and immunities assumed a more bitter character at the end of the fifteenth and beginning of the sixteenth centuries. The city chronicles dwell with preference on scandals connected with the clergy and often exaggerate them. Hence the cities were quick in joining the revolutionary movement started by Luther. Besides earlier heresies had familiarized the people with a number of errors that were soon to be preached through one-half of Europe. Hus had attacked the divine hierarchy. John von Wesel, professor at the University of Erfurt (d. 1481), denied the authority of General Councils, oral tradition, the primacy of the Holy See and other dogmas. Thus the soil was prepared for a religious upheaval.

185. **Political State of Germany.** — Maximilian I. had earnestly worked for a reform of the lawless and turbulent condition of the Empire which he had inherited from the weak Frederic III. The right of private warfare was, indeed, abolished and a perpetual public peace established in the diet of Worms, 1495. The Empire was divided into "Circles" or districts with a view to the better maintenance of law and order. But the indispensable means of carrying out these laws, imperial taxation and an imperial army, though frequently promised, were persistently denied by the territorial

princes. Thus on the eve of the Revolution every description of outrage and violence went unpunished, and the Empire became a prey to anarchy and confusion.

186. The Social State of Germany. — In proportion as the princes and cities became powerful the lower nobility or imperial knighthood fell lower and lower into ignorance, poverty and highway robbery. The excessive luxury in dress and living dominating all classes in consequence of the industrial and commercial prosperity during the greater part of the fifteenth century, contributed to the impoverishment of this order. Under the leadership of robber knights like Francis of Sickingen and the teachings of Ulric of Hutten, numbers of highwaymen with a crest, who possessed little more than a castle or keep perched upon a rock and lived with their marauding troopers upon the booty of townsfolk, merchants and travelers, were ready at any moment to break out into open rebellion.

The peasants during the same period had been very prosperous. They were personally free, had their own village assemblies and managed their own affairs. The feudal services which they owed their lords were not exorbitant. Bond service had almost entirely disappeared by the middle of the century. But the position of the peasants grew much worse towards the end of the period, partly through their own extravagant living, partly through the exactions of the great merchant companies. These corporations everywhere organized trusts and monopolies, suppressed the small traders in towns and cities and artificially raised the prices of necessaries to an exorbitant height. During the twelve years preceding the Peasants' War many articles in common use rose one hundred per cent and more in price. But the chief causes of the widespread discontent of the peasantry were the new burdens imposed on them by the advice of the Roman jurists, the counsellors and seducers of princes and bishops. Emissaries of the Hussites availed themselves of the general unrest of the masses. German soldiers who had served under Bohemian leaders, spread the communistic principles of the Taborites among the peasants of Silesia, Franconia and Saxony. The socialistic ideas of the sect were laid down in the "Reformation of Emperor Sigismund," the first revolutionary book in Germany, written by a Hussite priest in 1438 and frequently republished since 1490. Among other agents of anarchy, Hans Boehm, a bag-piper of Nichlashausen, preached to enormous crowds, that all governments, spiritual and temporal, all taxes, all private property, all social differences must be abolished. The peasants began to arm themselves and to raise the bundschuh, i. e., to organize under field signs, representing a peasant's clog carried on a pole. "Bundschuhs" were carried by the peasants of Bavaria, Alsace, Suabia and along the Rhine. The most dangerous was the rising of "Poor Conrad" against duke Ulric, whom popular hatred had dubbed "the hangman of Würtemberg." Well-to-do farmers took part in it, because they were afraid of the re-introduction of serfdom. The poorer citizens made common cause with the

peasants. In all these risings, however, there was as yet no trace of the terrible excesses of the Peasants' War, when all the divers conspiracies of the lower classes received a common watchword in Luther's "Evangelical liberty."

187. Conclusion. — Granting all the abuses of the pre-reformation period, the corruption was neither so deep nor so general as to justify a revolutionary apostasy. "Luther's most earnest remonstrances," says a prominent Protestant historian of our time,* "were directed not against bad but against good works and the stress laid upon them by the advocates of the old religion. If that religion had been in its practice so generally corrupt as it is represented to have been by modern writers, such denunciations were idle." No amount of human frailty could ever give the so-called reformers a right to attack what is divine and immutable in the Church of Christ, its doctrine, its sacraments, its divine constitution under the primacy of the successors of St. Peter. The movement, begun under the pretext of a reformation, like every other heresy that assailed the Church in previous times, was from the outset a heretical schism, got up by the indomitable pride of its authors and supported by the multifarious human passions of its promoters.

Italy on the *Eve of the Reformation:* Pastor-Antrobus: vol. 5, *Introduction*, pp. 3–228. — J. B. Christophe: *Hist. de la Papauté pendant le XV. siècle.* — J. Fèvre: *Histoire apologetique de la Papauté.* — Kenelm N. Digby: *Mores Catholici or Ages of Faith.* — A. Kobler, S. J.: *Katholisches Leben im Mittelalter.* — Reumont: *Vittoria Colonna* (*Life, Poetry and Faith in the XVI. Century*). — A. M. Weiss: *Vor der Reformation*: H. P. B. vol. 79, pp. 17, 98, 185. — M. Zucchi: *Misericordia of Florence:* D. R. '94, 2, p. 333. — T. B. Scannel: *The Papacy from Martin V. to Alexander VI.; Popes of the Renaissance:* D. R. '92, 2, p. 1.; '95, 2, p. 305. — J. Rickaby, *History of the Renaissance Popes*, M. '90, 3, p. 41. — On the *Popes from Paul II. to Leo X.:* Reuben Parsons, vol. 3, pp. 173–300. — Roscoe: *Leo X.* — On Alexander VI.: Clement: *Les Borgia;* J. B. Scannel, D. R. '96, 2, p. 309: J. J. Barry, A. C. Q., vol. 3, p. 321; *Revue de Questions historiques*, v. 9, p. 466.

Germany: J. Janssen: *History of the German People; Agricultural Life*, vol. 1, pp. 309–354; *Condition of the Artisans; Commerce and Capital*, vol. 2, pp. 1–104; *The Holy Roman Empire, Introduction of a Foreign Code*, pp. 105–186; *Survey and Retrospect*, pp. 285–302. — J. M. Dux: *Der deutsche Kardinal Nikolaus von Cusà.* — Scharpff: *N. von Cusa als Reformator.* — E. Gothein: *Politische and religiöse Volksbewegungen vor der Reformation.*

* Brewer: Henry VIII., I. p. 254, note 2.

BOOK II.

THE PROTESTANT REVOLUTION.

CHAPTER I.

THE AGE OF CHARLES V.

§ 1.

LUTHER'S FALL.

188. Dr. Martin Luther. — Martin Luther was born in the Saxon town of Eisleben, 1483, of poor but honest parents. Whilst studying humanities at Magdeburg and Eisenach, and philosophy at the University of Erfurt, he keenly felt the stress of poverty, a feeling which left a sting of bitterness in his character. Frightened by an accident in which either he himself was prostrated or a friend killed at his side by a stroke of lightning, he entered with more precipitancy than vocation the Augustinian monastery at Erfurt, 1503. In 1507 he was promoted to the priesthood, and obtained the following year a professorship at the University of Wittenberg, founded in 1502 by Frederic, the elector of Saxony, and a few years later, the doctorate of theology. Luther was an indifferent scholar but endowed with a strong natural eloquence, and a writer who handled his native language with singular force and popularity, and with no scruples as to the decencies of life. In his studies he gave preference to the humanistic over the scholastic system. Before his fall he was moral, religious, assiduous in prayer and work, but self-willed, restless, scrupulous, given to extremes, and relying more on his own works and excessive penances than on the grace of God and the mercy of Christ. It was spiritual pride that brought him to his fall. His failure to curb his irrascible, proud and sensual nature by Pelagian self-reliance, created in him a state of despondency and despair from which he passed over to the opposite extreme. He thought out a new doctrine, the fundamental source of all his

errors, which asserted the absolute corruption of human nature, and a merely external justification to be obtained by strong faith, i. e., *trust* in the merits of Christ. He thus based his hopes of salvation on a system which destroyed the spiritual powers of man, and ascribed the whole work of justification to God alone, without penance, moral improvement or any kind of co-operation save a blind trust on the part of man. His further assertion of the uselessness, nay sinfulness of good works, and his denial of free-will were but logical deductions from his fundamental error. For these views he sought a confirmation in the Epistles of St. Paul and the writings of St. Augustine. As early as 1515 he had made this system his own; in 1516 it had entered into the teachings of the University of Wittenberg. The publication of the Leonine indulgence was not the *cause* but only the occasion of his first public attack upon the Church.

189. Luther and Tetzel. — In 1514 Pope Leo X. had issued an indulgence under the usual conditions of penance and contrition, to which was added that of a contribution, according to the means of the donor, towards the building of new St. Peter's in Rome. In 1517 the Pope intrusted the publication of the bull in Germany to Albrecht of Brandenburg, Archbishop of Mainz, who appointed the Dominican, John Tetzel, a good preacher and a worthy priest, as his chief commissary. The preaching of the indulgence in the neighborhood of Wittenberg was seized by Luther as a welcome opportunity to give a wider publicity to his views. Accordingly on the eve of All Saints he affixed to the doors of the castle-church of Wittenberg his famous 95 theses, in which he assailed not only the abuses really committed in some parts of the country, but the doctrine itself of indulgences, of good works, and of the spiritual power of the Roman Pontiff, and challenged all comers to disprove the correctness of his statements. Tetzel's doctrine of indulgences for the living was correct, but he was not free from exaggerations in his doctrine of indulgences for the dead. The stories, however, of his selling indulgences, appropriating the moneys for his own use, or violating the reverence due to the Blessed Virgin, are later inventions, refuted by Albrecht of Brandenburg, the magistrates of Halle, and Luther himself in a letter addressed to Tetzel. Luther attacked Tetzel be-

cause the latter's doctrine clashed with his own heretical system. The theses spread rapidly through Europe; numerous pamphlets were written for and against them. Luther was at once magnified into a hero of reform. The princes disliked the exportation of German money. Many of the clergy were displeased with the temporary suspension of other indulgences. The common people were captivated by Luther's phrases, that "the real treasures of the Church were the poor." The humanists were exuberant in their applause of the monk, who dared single-handed to assail the Pope. Even bishops and prelates were unsound in their views on indulgences, the papal power, etc. Very few, however, suspected the importance of the movement, and looked upon it as another Reuchlin controversy (see book I., no. 169). The only partisans as yet of Luther's *doctrinal* system were the professors of Wittenberg.

190. Attempts at Reconciliation. — Luther was summoned to Rome, but through the influence of Frederic of Saxony and other friends obtained from Leo X. a change of venue which allowed him to plead his cause before the virtuous and learned Cardinal Thomas di Vio of Gaeta (Cardinal Cajetanus). He met the Cardinal at Augsburg but obstinately refused to retract his errors, and appealed from the ill-informed Pope to the Pope to be better informed. Leo X. had meanwhile issued a bull vindicating the Catholic doctrine of indulgences. In order to weaken its effect in Germany, Luther anticipated its publication by an appeal to a General Council. Leo's next attempt to heal the growing schism by sending his chamberlain Charles of Miltiz, a friend of Frederic of Saxony to Germany, proved a dismal failure. The vain and incapable Miltiz bestowed his flatteries on Luther to please his protector, and treated Tetzel and other defenders of the faith as the authors of the disturbance. Grief over this injustice caused Tetzel's speedy death, whilst Luther boasted that he had conquered the world and detached it from the Pope, 1518–19.

191. Indulgences. — The charge that an indulgence was meant of itself to remit the guilt as well as the punishment of sin, and consequently dispensed with the necessity of either sorrow or confession, is based on a misunderstanding of the phrase "Indulgentia a poena et a culpa" (Indulgence for punishment and guilt). The suggestion that indulgences could remit the guilt of sin, was always regarded as too preposterous in the Church to admit of argument. Not one theologian or canonist of repute taught that an indulgence could remit the guilt of sin. Real penitence, confession and amendment of life were always considered essential conditions for gaining an indulgence, i. e. a remission of *temporal* punishment due to sin. The popular expression "a poena et a culpa," was probably first used in the

thirteenth century if not earlier. It was generally understood by the clergy and people, among whom it was in familiar use, to signify vaguely the most ample form of plenary indulgence which it was in the Pope's power to grant. Theologians and canonists repudiated the phrase, characterized it as unthelogial, or explained the sense in which it might be correctly understood. Their verdict agrees in two points, that such an indulgence does not pretend to remit guilt, and that to gain any indulgence whatever the state of grace is necessary. Of the explanations the most common was that culpa referred to the extraordinary faculties by which the confessor was empowered to absolve from cases otherwise *reserved* to higher authorities (the Pope or the bishop, etc.), and poena to the remission of temporal punishment. This doctrine, that the gaining of an indulgence presupposed the state of grace, respectively contrition and confession, was not only held at the universities, but occurs in the numerous sermons preserved from pre-Lutheran times, and was faithfully transmitted to the laity who, apart from exceptional cases of extreme ignorance, were well instructed in the doctrine of indulgences, as Dr. Janssen has amply proved in his History of the German People.

192. The Disputation of Leipsic. — The short but incisive refutation of Luther's theses by Dr. Eck led to a public disputation between himself and Luther's friend, Dr. Carlstadt, in which Luther himself took part. It was held in Leipsic, in presence of George, duke of Saxony,* and lasted nineteen days. Pressed by his antagonist who was his superior both in learning and temper, Luther rejected the epistle of St. James, the primacy of the See of St. Peter, and the infallibility of General Councils, to which he had previously appealed. The victory was universally accorded to Dr. Eck. Luther himself owned his defeat.

The disputation on the one hand confirmed duke George, the city and university of Leipsic and many other learned Catholics in the old faith, on the other hand it exasperated Luther's pride, and impelled him to proclaim the Pope as the antichrist, and himself as a true evangelist, commissioned by an immediate revelation of God to preach the new "gospel" as the only means of salvation.

193. Luther's Excommunication, 1520. — Meanwhile all those who hoped to gain by a revolt against the Church or the State, covetous princes and their Roman jurists, the revolutionary knights of the Empire, poets and humanists, Bohemian Hussites, immoral clerics, monks tired of their vows, disaffected peasants, however antagonistic their several interests might be, united in supporting the

* Electoral and ducal Saxony were distinct territories.

apostate monk of Wittenberg. Pious and serious men, who in the beginning had joined the movement, hoping that it might lead to a reformation of manners, withdrew from it, when they saw it directed not against abuses, but against revealed truths and divine institutions. Many of the German bishops had not a word to say in defense of the Christian revelation and the rights of the Church. Under these circumstances Luther, after the disputation at Leipsic, began to demolish what was left of the ecclesiastical fabric, the doctrine of the Sacraments, the Sacrifice of Mass, the hierarchy, the priesthood, and to set up an invisible church with a universal priesthood governed by evangelical liberty. In his inflammatory writings he called upon the Emperor and the nobles to secularize the cathedrals for the benefit of the younger-born nobles, to tear Germany from the spiritual jurisdiction of Rome, to abolish the feudal supremacy of the Pope over Naples, to confiscate the States of the Church, and to wash their hands in the blood of the Cardinals and the Pope. After mature deliberation Leo X. in July, 1520, issued a bull in which 41 of Luther's propositions were condemned, and he himself commanded to retract within sixty days under pain of excommunication. Frederic, elector of Saxony, confirmed in his protectorate of Luther by the advice of Erasmus, refused to receive the papal legate Aleander and paid no regard to the papal bull, whilst Luther published the most scurrilous attacks against the Holy See ("On the Babylonian Captivity of the Church" "Against the Execrable Bull of Antichrist"), and finally burnt the papal bull and a copy of the canon law before the Elster gate of Wittenberg, thus openly declaring war against the Church and the whole Christian Past, December 10, 1520. The excommunication followed Jan. 3, 1521.

Joannes Janssen-A. M. Christie: *History of the German People at the Close of the Middle Ages*, vol. 3, book 5: *The Revolution, etc., up to the Diet of Worms.*—B. Jungmann: *Dissertationes*, vol. 7; Dissert. 37, pp. 1-31. — R. Parsons: *Studies*, vol. 3: *The Pontificate of Leo X.*, p. 274; *The Commencement of Protestantism; Luther*, p. 301. — Card. Hergenroether: *Kirchengeschichte*, vol. 2, pp. 240-249. — Rt. Rev. J. M. Spalding: *The Protestant Reformation in Germany and Switzerland*, vol. 1, pp. 17-128. — Alzog-Pabisch-Byrne: *Manual of Universal Church Hist.*, vol. 3 ch. 3.—Hefele-Hergenroether: *Conciliengeschichte*, vol. 9, pp. 1-155. — Darras: *History of the Cath. Church; Leo X.*, vol. 4, pp. 1-67. — *Martin Luther*, A. C. Q., vol. 8, p. 689. — S. F. Smith, S. J.: *Luther and Tetzel:* C. T. S. P., vol. 43. — On *Tetzel:* H. P. B., vol. 33, p. 380. — Dr. N. Paulus: *Johann Tetzel der Ablassprediger.* — Gröne: *Luther und Tetzel.* — On *Dr. Eck:* Wiedemann: *Dr. T. Eck;* Silbernagel; H. P. B.: vol. 98, p. 747; vol. 18, 121; *Luther and Eck*, (Disputation of Leipsic): Katholik, '72, 2, pp. 297, 437, 531. — On *Albrecht of Brandenburg:* Katholik, '76, 1, pp. 172, 257: '78, 1, p. 415. — On *George of Saxony:* H. P. B., vol. 46. pp. 261, 345, 450, 525, 579, 645.

§ 2.

THE DIET OF WORMS.

194. Election of Emperor Charles V., 1519–1556.— Maximilian I., always a devout and staunch Catholic, died a most edifying death in 1519. Three candidates aspired to the imperial crown, Charles I. of Spain, Francis I. of France, and Henry VIII. of England. The latter, however, not pressing his demands, soon dropped out of the race. At first the chances of Francis seemed best; he was able by unstinted bribery to outbid Charles. But popular opinion backed by the Suabian League assumed so threatening an attitude against the French candidature, that the haggling electors were forced to cast their votes for Charles I., as Emperor Charles V. Charles had inherited the Burgundian lands from his father, Philip the Fair, archduke of Austria (1506), the kingdoms of Spain, Navarre, Naples, with Sicily, Sardinia and Corsica, Oran in Africa, and Spanish America, from his grandfather, Ferdinand of Aragon (1516), and the Austrian possessions from his other grandfather, Maximillian I. Thus the Spanish monarchy became the greatest power of Europe for the century. At his coronation in Aachen, 1520, Charles V. swore to protect the Church and to maintain the rights of the Holy See. In a long and eventful reign he on the whole fairly kept his coronation oath.

195. The Diet of Worms, 1521.— From Aachen the Emperor-elect proceeded to the famous Diet of Worms summoned to devise means for the restoration of religious peace. The princes favorable to Luther demanded a regular trial of the ex-friar before the diet. The papal legate Aleander, a churchman of great virtue and learning, rightfully objected against this setting aside of a sentence already passed by the highest competent tribunal. The Emperor took a middle course and summoned Luther to the diet under a safe-conduct, not to dispute and to be judged but to give an account of his books and his readiness to revoke his errors.

In a powerful speech of three hours Aleander clearly showed the assembled princes, that Luther's proceedings threatened not only the stability of the Church, but the very existence of the Empire and the well-being of society. Luther acknowledged the books laid before him as his own, but refused to retract anything he had written. He would listen only to clear texts and arguments from Holy Writ. This position was unassailable because Luther accepted only his own interpretation as decisive and rejected books at his pleasure. Thereupon Charles V. issued an edict which placed Luther under

the ban of the Empire as an obstinate heretic and ordered his books to be burnt. The sentence of the ban was to take effect after the lapse of the twenty-one days which his safe-conduct still allowed him. On retiring from Worms Luther's party was apparently attacked by armed men in disguise, and Luther was conveyed to the Wartburg, a castle of Frederic of Saxony. A great outcry at once rose among the friends of Luther, that the imperial safe-conduct had been violated, and the reformer foully murdered. But it soon leaked out that Frederic had arranged the abduction for the sake of protecting him against the consequences of the ban. Here he began the translation of the Bible into German, manipulating the text so as to fit his own tenets. A great number of pamphlets went forth from Wartburg, the "Patmos" of the new "evangelist."

196. Disturbances at Wittenberg. — Meanwhile the seed sown by Luther began to bear fruit. In Erfurt his adherents sacked or burnt in a few days over sixty houses of the clergy, tore up legal documents, and destroyed whole libraries, 1521. At Wittenberg a storm was roused by Carlstadt, Nicholas Stork and his "prophets of Zwickau," who pretended to see visions, rebaptized those who had received the sacrament in their childhood (anabaptism), rejected Luther's "gospel" of salvation by faith alone, and founded a new Kingdom of God on the basis of absolute social equality and communism of goods. The disturbers, assisted by the students of Wittenberg, broke sacred images, destroyed altars and confessionals, ransacked churches, and declared war against all learning, even against the elementary schools. Luther hastened from the Wartburg, "to rap these visionaries on the snout," drove his opponents from Wittenberg and restored some order.

Assisted by his friend Melanchthon, he now abolished the Sacrifice of Mass, introduced a new form of worship with the liturgy in German, and communion under both species. Whilst he retained a sort of real presence (Impanation), he rejected Transubstantiation.

197. Edict of Worms Not Carried Out. — Outside the Austrian States, Bavaria, Brandenburg, the duchy of Saxony and some ecclesiastical territories, the Edict of Worms remained a dead letter. The Emperor was absent, occupied with his wars. The regency was

weak, divided, and in part favorable to Lutheranism. The diets frittered away their time in formulating grievances against Rome instead of remedying the evils at home. Thus neither the pious Hadrian VI. (1521–23) who had been the tutor of Charles V. and subsequently his viceroy in Spain, and as Pope devoted all his energy to a reformation of manners, nor his successor, Julius de Medici who assumed the name of Clement VII. (1523–34) were able to restore religious peace to Germany.

Dr. Janssen: *Diet of Worms*, etc., vol. 3, bk. 6.—B. Jungmann: l. c., pp. 35–36.—Darras: *Pontificates of Adrain VI. and Clement VII.*, vol. 4, pp. 68–106.—Alzog: vol. 3, ch. 1.—Hergenroether: vol. 2, pp. 255–260.—Hefele-Hergenroether: vol. 9, pp. 173–324.—J. M. Stone: *The Rise of Protestantism in Germany:* M. '96, 3, p. 200.—G. Evers: *Martin Luther.*—J. Verres, D. D.: *Luther, a Historical Portrait.*—W. Laughnan: *Martin Luther;* M. '83, 3, 305, 457.—Dr. Constantin von Hoefler: *Papst Hadrian VI.*—*Pope Adrian VI.:* M., vol. 12, p. 350.—L. P. Gachard: *Correspondence de Charlequint et d' Adrian VI.*

§ 3.

THE SOCIAL REVOLUTION.

198. The Rising of Sickingen.—The disturbances at Erfurt and Wittenberg were but the forerunners of social upheavals on a larger scale. In the first place the knights of the Empire banded together in large numbers under Francis of Sickingen and Ulric of Hutten "to make an opening for the gospel" of their friend Luther. This motto covered a long harbored plan to restore the power of the knights by the overthrow of the spiritual princes. This end accomplished, the secular princes were to be assailed in their turn. The first object of attack was the Archbishop of Trier, one of the energetic opponents of Luther. With an army of 5,000 foot and 1,500 horse Sickingen besieged Trier, counting upon a rising within the walls. But the citizens proved loyal to their Archbishop, and the city held out till some of the neighboring princes came to the rescue. Sickingen had to raise the siege, and retired to his castles, leaving the ruins of burnt churches, monasteries and villages in his wake, 1522.

The following year Sickingen again put an armed force in the field and raided parts of the Palatine territory. But a league of Rhenish princes besieged him in his own castle of Landstuhl. Here Sickingen received his

mortal wound, and died reconciled with the Church. His castles and those of his adherents were broken or burnt out by the league. Hutten fled into Switzerland and died friendless, a victim of his immoral life, 1523.

199. Demands of the Peasants. — Hardly was the imperial knighthood defeated in their leader, when a new and far greater danger arose to society from the lower orders. Preachers without number, unfrocked priests and runaway monks proclaimed in the most violent language the gospel of hatred, envy and rebellion. Poor peasants allied themselves with the rabble of the cities and the scattered followers of Sickingen, formed "Evangelical Brotherhoods," "Christian Unions," and forced the better class of farmers and even nobles to join them, and the municipalities of infested towns to furnish them with arms and ammunition. They set up articles of the most revolutionary character, which all had to sign who fell into their power.

The 12 Articles set up by the Suabian peasants demanded among other things reforms as to feudal obligations, the use of forests and commons, the right of hunting and fishing, etc. While such demands were fair in themselves, they were asked upon the authority of Holy Writ as understood and interpreted by the peasants. Should they find other demands in Holy Writ, they said in the 12th Article, they would enforce them. Accordingly in a very short time the peasants of different territories went so far as to anticipate the dream of modern socialists. They wanted to abolish all vested rights of the upper classes and the clergy, to abolish all taxes, all social differences. They clamored for communism and anarchy, and claimed the right of exterminating the priesthood and of slaying all princes and nobles who should resist the peasants' will.

200. Luther's Responsibility. — The inhuman and sacrilegious character of this rebellion is directly traceable to the Lutheran agitation. Luther had set up the most flagrant example of rebellion against God-given authority and existing institutions heretofore known in history. His pamphlets were full of appeals to the worst human passions; burning convents, plundering and slaying priests and bishops were declared by him to be acts not only pleasing to God, but necessary under pain of damnation. He heaped calumnies and insults on the princes who closed their countries to his gospel, and hurled his invectives against the Emperor himself. His preachers and adherents, outside of Thuringia, were the chief speakers and leaders of the peasants. Thirty of the many circulating "Articles" were almost literally taken from his German writings; one of them declared Luther's enemies to be the peasants' enemies.

201. Spread and Suppression of the War. — The rising began in 1524 near the Lake of Constance, spread over Suabia, and became general in the spring of the following year. It extended to Alsace, the countries of the Rhine, the Neckar, and the Main, and southward far into the Austrian lands, involving the countries from the southern Alps almost to the Baltic in a general conflagration. Ulrich of Würtemberg called the rebels to his aid to recover his dominions. The extravagance reached its climax in Thuringia, where Thomas Münzer had chosen the city of Mühlhausen as the seat of his socialistic and communistic kingdom. The horrors committed recalled the days of the Hussite wars and the French Jacquerie. The sacking of clergy-houses, the looting of churches, the breaking of images, and worse still, the most horrible desecrations of the Blessed Sacrament were everywhere committed by the "Evangelical Brotherhoods." The nights were lit up with burning castles and monasteries. At Weinsberg all the nobles and knights headed by a piper had to run the gauntlet in single file to be pierced with the pikes of the peasants. The municipalities almost everywhere tried to save themselves at the expense of the clergy. The Suabian League under the command of the brave and energetic George Truchsess defeated the peasants wherever it met them. Some of the most powerful princes purposely held back, to allow the peasants time for destroying the spiritual principalities, that they might afterwards step in and change them into secular domains. But finally self-defense forced them to energetic action. In April the League inflicted a decisive defeat on the peasants near Ulm. In May George of Saxony and Philip of Hesse overthrew the Thuringian peasants at Frankenhausen. Thomas Münzer was captured and executed; he died reconciled with the Church. The duke of Lorraine restored order in Alsace. George Truchsess, who had defeated 30,000 in Würtemberg, routed another army intrenched at Koenigshofen. The reduction of the city of Würzburg by the united forces of the Suabian League, the elector of Trier and the palsgrave on June 7 decided the fortunes of Franconia. Shortly after the peasants on the Upper Rhine and the Black Forest either surrendered or were crushed.

202. Luther's Attitude. — At the beginning of the outbreak Luther had published a pamphlet, in which he blamed the rising in language, as yielding

and conciliatory to the peasants as it was violent and insulting to the bishops and the Catholic princes. Only when it became evident, that the princes would crush the rebellion, he savagely turned against the peasants and hounded on the princes in their work of blood. "Strike," said he to the princes, "strike, slay front and rear, nothing is more devilish than sedition. There must be no sleep, no patience, no mercy; they are the children of the devil."

And still surrounded by the carnage of this terrible war, Luther took a wife, the escaped nun Catharine of Bora.

203. Effects. — More than 1,000 castles and monasteries all over Germany lay in ashes. Contemporary writers estimate the number of slain at 130,000 to 150,000. Thousands were executed, or blinded, or had their hands or fingers chopped off in punishment. Hundreds of villages were burnt by the avenging troops, the fields untilled, the cost of living enormously raised. The country was filled with beggared widows and orphans. During the rebellion the peasants had everywhere burnt the records and contracts fixing their titles, rents and services; the survivors had now to consent to new, and as a rule, to harsher conditions than before, or were refused written contracts and made dependent on the arbitrary will of their lords. For centuries the peasantry were unable to regain the prosperity which they had enjoyed in the 15th century. For the character of the Protestant Revolution in Germany the Peasants' War was decisive. Luther and his followers ceased to be men of the people, they became men of the princes, defenders of princely absolutism, apostles of servility for the people, preachers of passive, unconditional obedience. While the Catholic Church, in theory always, in practice as a rule, defended the rights of the people, even against imperial abuse of power, and mostly with success; the Lutherans were the first among Germanic races to proclaim tyranny and servility as necessary postulates of their new religion.

204. The Anabaptists of Münster, 1534–35. — The Anabaptists, after the defeat of the peasants, continued to spread as a secret society over Germany and the Netherlands, and rose once more to temporary power in the city of Münster in Westphalia. By the introduction of Protestantism the city had become a refuge for the Anabaptists, who flocked thither in crowds, chiefly from the Low Countries. Having gained the ascendency they expelled those who refused to be rebaptized, destroyed churches, monasteries and libraries, and established communism. John of Leyden deposed the magis-

trates, appointed twelve judges, crowned himself King of New Zion, and introduced polygamy, himself taking seventeen wives, all in obedience to "divine revelations." The city became the hotbed of the most shameful excesses, a scene of riotous anarchy. Münster held out for eighteen months against the bishop and his allies who besieged it. After the city had been carried by storm in June, 1535, the leaders were tormented and executed. The overthrow of the Anabaptists put an end to Protestantism in Münster.

Dr. J. Janssen-A. M. Christie: vol. 3. *Franz von Sickingen's Attempt*, etc., pp. 276-380; vol. 4, 1-120. *The S[illegible] Revolution*, vol. 4, book 7, pp. 121-369. — Alzog: vol. 3, ch. 1. *Hergenroether*, K. G.: vol. 2, pp. 268-272.— Hefele-Hergenroether, C. G., vol. 9, p. 421. — v. Weiss: *Weltgeschichte*, vol. 7, pp. 629-702. — A. H. Johnson: *The Peasants' War; Europe in the Sixteenth Century*, p. 176.— C. W. C. Oman: *The German Peasants' War of 1525:* E. H. R., v. 5, p. 65; *On the Peasants' War* (causes, character, history, results), H. P. B., vol. 6, pp. 321, 449, 427, 641; vol. 7, pp. 176, 238, 361; vol. 8, p. 29. — On *the Condition of the Peasantry*: H. P. B , vol. 124, pp. 18. 167, 249. — On *Luther's Friendship with Ulrich v. Hutten: Katholik:* '97, 2, 325; H. P. B , vol. 4, p. 257. — On *Goetz von Berlichingen*, St., vol. 16, pp. 35, 174, 298, 527; vol. 17, p. 289. — On *Francis of Sickingen:* H. P B., vol. 4, pp. 321, 577, 675.

§ 4.

THE MAKING OF PROTESTANTISM.

205. Dependence on Territorial Princes. — Protestantism in Germany owed its firm establishment chiefly to its union with the territorial princes. The rising of the imperial knighthood in alliance with and in the name of the "gospel" had failed. The independence of the lower nobility was destroyed. The revolt of the peasants was overthrown and ended in the complete enslavement of the lower orders. The result of both victories was a great increase of power and independence for the territorial lords. The Emperor was now the only obstacle in the way of the princes to absolute independence. Hence the princes saw their interests identified with those of the religious rebels, who hated the Catholic Emperor as the official protector of the Church. On the other hand Luther and Melanchthon and their friends bitterly felt the general demoralization, the breaking up of churches and schools, the abject poverty of the new preachers, and the contempt of all religion resulting from the Lutheran agitation. In this pressing necessity the so-called Reformers threw themselves unconditionally into the arms of the territorial princes. Thus it happened that the doctrine of passive obedience to the princes and of the regulation of all church questions by the princes became the principal dogma of

Protestantism in Germany; in fact, hatred of Rome and submission to state or lay authority became the one distinctive mark of Protestantism in every country.

206. The Diet of Speyer, 1526. — Frederic the "Wise," elector of Saxony, died a Catholic after all in 1525. He was succeeded by his Lutheran brother John, who introduced the new religion in the Electorate. Albrecht of Brandenburg, grandmaster of the Teutonic Order, had adopted Lutheranism, renounced his vows and married in 1525. To his apostasy from the Church he now added treason to the Empire by accepting Eastern Prussia as a secular fief from king Sigismund of Poland. Two bishops and many knights of the Order from which the spirit of discipline had long ago departed, joined him; the rest were banished from the country. In a similar way Philip, landgrave of Hesse, and Casimir of Brandenburg-Culmbach, "reformed" their respective territories.

Meanwhile Catholics and Protestants had begun to form leagues; the Catholics for the defense of their faith and the reformation of manners in their own territories (Leagues of Ratisbon and Dessau, 1524), the Protestants, to spread the innovations into other territories, if needs be, by force (League of Torgau, 1526). The Diet of Speyer became the starting-point for the foundations of territorial churches. Here the Lutheran princes acted for the first time as a compact political party, and extorted from archduke Ferdinand, who was in need of their aid against the invading Turks, an enactment concerning the Decree of Worms, which let them have their own way. Philip of Hesse, John of Saxony, and Casimir of Brandenburg were the first to introduce a church establishment on the principle, that the reigning prince, by his office, is the supreme authority in whatever relates to church government. The example was followed by other Lutheran princes and many imperial cities. The introduction of territorial churches was invariably followed by the confiscation and plundering of ecclesiastical property.

207. Diet of Speyer, 1529. — The unsettled state of Germany and the presence of the Turks in Hungary induced Charles V., still absent, to summon a new diet to Speyer in 1529. The Catholic majority passed a decree, that the Lutheran states were to grant toleration to Catholics, but might retain the new worship and church government, whilst the Edict of Worms should remain binding in the

Catholic states, and that further innovations should be avoided, till the assembling of a General Council. The Lutheran minority protested against this conciliatory enactment, and obtained by this act the essentially negative name of Protestants. They were unwilling either to grant the Catholics a liberty which they had won for themselves, or to forego the right which they claimed of continuing their war against the Church. Having made the religious separation incurable, the protesting princes granted the required aid against the Turks.

208. **Zwinglianism in Switzerland.** — At the time when Luther began to preach his gospel in Saxony, Ulrich Zwingli, since 1518 priest at the minster of Zürich, in his private life a rake and cynic, founded a system similar to Luther's, which culminates in the blasphemous proposition that God is the immediate author of every sin. In the doctrine of the Eucharist, by denying every vestige of the Real Presence, he was at issue not only with the Church, but also with Luther. The town council of Zürich, in 1525, founded a state church, in which Zwingli's doctrines alone were to be preached as the pure gospel. The change was accompanied by the wholesale robbery, image-breaking and sacrileges, which everywhere characterized the introduction of Protestantism. The example of Zürich was followed by Bern, Basel and a few other cantons; seven of the thirteen cantons, among them the original ones, **Uri, Schwyz and Unterwalden,** rejected the innovation; two were divided in their allegiance. The Protestant cities of Switzerland leagued themselves with the Suabian cities that had adopted Zwinglianism, for the purpose of forcing the new doctrine on the Catholic cantons, while in their own territory they refused freedom of worship to Catholics. The league of the Catholic cantons concluded in 1529 an alliance with Ferdinand of Austria, for the defense of the ancient faith in their own territories, excluding all political aims. Twice the Catholics were called upon to defend their religion against the violent aggressions of Zürich. The decisive battle was fought at Cappel, 1531. The forces of Zürich were completely defeated; Zwingli himself was among the slain. In the peace which followed, the Catholic religion was guaranteed to the Catholic cantons and Zürich had to dissolve its armed confederation with the other Swiss and Suabian cities. The victorious Catholics in no way interfered with the internal affairs of the Zwinglian cantons. Zwingli's particular doctrines were subsequently merged into Calvinism.

209. **Protestantism in Sweden.** — By the Union of Calmar, 1397, the Scandinavian kingdoms of Denmark, Sweden and Norway had been joined in a personal union under the kings of Denmark. The feudal nobility had, notwithstanding, exercised an undue power in these kingdoms. Christian

II. of Denmark, 1513, made it his aim to break down the great power of the aristocracy, spiritual and temporal. For this purpose he favored Lutheranism. By a previous subjugation of Sweden, which tried to break loose from Denmark, Christian hoped to become strong enough to crush the nobility at home. With foreign mercenaries he invaded Sweden, took Stockholm and after being crowned king of Sweden, perpetrated the cruel massacre of Stockholm. Among hosts of others put to death were ninety-four Swedes of high birth, one of whom was the father of Gustavus Ericson, of the House of Wasa. Gustavus organized the peasants and mountaineers of Sweden, was reinforced by a portion of the regular troops, overthrew the domination of Denmark (1521), and was elected king (1523–1560). In order to win for the crown the political rights of the bishops and the property of the Church, he undertook, with singular hypocrisy towards Rome, and great cruelty at home, to introduce Lutheranism. The people, devoutly Catholic, were opposed to any religious innovation, and were confirmed in their opposition by the earnest zeal of their bishops, some of whom paid with their lives for the discharge of their pastoral duties. It was the threat of the king to abdicate, and the fear of anarchy or Danish rule, which in 1527 induced a number of deputies of all the estates, to sacrifice the Church to the royal will. In 1529 the "Reformation" was completed. It was, however, only after many popular risings, suppressed with cruel severity, that the national apostasy was gradually forced on the people.

210. **Protestantism in Denmark, Norway and Elsewhere.** — After his Swedish campaign, Christian II., personally a dissolute despot, thought himself strong enough to introduce Protestantism in Denmark, by inaugurating a period of cruel persecution. But the people had no mind whatever to change their religion, and the estates of the realm deposed him. His uncle, Frederic, duke of Schleswig, took the oath required by the diet to maintain intact the Catholic religion, and was chosen king of Denmark (Frederic I., 1523–33). As soon as he learned that Christian was seeking Protestant aid in Germany to reconquer his kingdom, he publicly avowed his secret Lutheranism (1526), gained the nobles by grants of church property, and secured to Protestantism equal rights with the Catholic Church. Thereupon Christian II. joined the Catholic party, and invaded Denmark. In the civil war which ensued Christian fell into the hands of his rival and was kept a prisoner for the rest of his life. Christian III., the son and successor of Frederic I., completed the work begun by his father. Episcopal jurisdiction was abolished, the property of the Church divided between the king and the nobles, Catholics were deprived of all offices, and of the right of inheriting, and priests banished under penalty of death. By such means the Catholic religion was not only oppressed, but annihilated in the kingdom of Denmark and its dependencies, Norway and Schleswig.

From East Prussia and Bohemia Lutheranism entered Poland, where the nobles, in their tendency to resist the king, supported the religious innova-

tions, but king Sigismund I. (1501–1548) was able to check the spread of the sects.

211. Calvinism — John Calvin. — John Calvin was born at Noyon in Picardy, France, 1509. He was a scholar of great ability. After a course of philosophical, theological and legal studies he threw himself on humanism. He became strongly impressed with the teachings of the Wittenberg school, but was not satisfied with Luther's doctrine of justification. To escape a trial for heresy he left Paris in 1534, and after roaming about France came to Basel. Here he published his compendium of the Christian Religion (*Institutio Religionis Christianæ*) in which he developed his theological system. This book with its many editions repeatedly modified, exercised a wide-spread influence and caused the municipality of Geneva to invite him to make his stay in the city. A bitter quarrel between the bishop and the citizens and the agitation of Zwinglian preachers had prepared the ground. He accepted the invitation in 1536, and was soon in a position to supplant the clergy and the magistracy by his domineering severity. An anti-Calvinistic party, which gradually formed, expelled him in 1538. When a new administration recalled him, he dictated the conditions of his return, which secured to him an almost unlimited power in spiritual and temporal affairs. In September, 1541, he held his triumphant entry in Geneva.

212. **Calvin's System.** — The most prominent point in Calvinism is the doctrine of *absolute predestination*, according to which some men are created for the enjoyment of everlasting happiness, others for the sufferance of everlasting misery. God is the pre-ordaining author of good and evil. Man falls, because an overmastering Providence ordains that he shall fall. The Sacraments have no connection with sanctifying grace, the Eucharist no vestige of the real presence. Only the predestined have the true faith which carries with it the certainty of salvation. The church organization is simple and democratic. There are three grades in the ministry: pastors, deacons and elders. God's call to the ministry is indicated through the voice of the people. Every Calvinistic community is an independent republic. The only bond of union between the individual churches is found in the synod. Calvin was an inveterate foe of all ceremonies, of whatever embellishes divine worship, elevates the soul, or warms the heart. Wherever this gloomy system was firmly established, it became the source of relentless fanaticism and cruel intolerance.

213. Calvin's Rule in Geneva. — Calvin worked out a theocratic system of government for Geneva and placed himself at its

head. The prerogatives claimed for himself far outstripped anything the mediaeval Popes are said to have claimed. A Court of Discipline tried and punished all infractions of morality. His spies invaded every home. Critics of his actions or his doctrines were severely punished, cast into prison, or executed. (Michael Servetus burnt for his views on the Holy Trinity.) Within four years there were between 800 or 900 cases of imprisonment, 76 decrees of exile, and 58 executions among the 15,000 inhabitants of Geneva. Having established his political power, Calvin founded his Academy, through the influence of which Calvinism supplanted Zwinglianism in the Swiss cantons. From Geneva Calvinism spread into France, Germany, especially the Palatinate, the Netherlands, England, Scotland, Poland and Hungary. Calvin died 1564. His work was continued by Theodore Beza.

214. Causes of the Spread of Protestantism. – It was not any higher morality which attracted the different classes to the new gospel of the so-called reformers. On the contrary their teaching gave ample scope to the inborn passions of human nature. (a) The bold rebellion of the leaders and their catchwords of "independence of thought," "Christian liberty," "universal priesthood," whilst flattering human pride, freed their adherents from the yoke of obedience. The doctrine of nature's radical corruption, and of salvation by faith alone allowed them to give full reins to their lower appetites. (b) The masses were systematically deceived by the impassioned agitation, the popular eloquence, the appeals to their prejudices and the later unscrupulous misrepresentations of Catholic teaching, carried on by the leaders in sermons, pamphlets, libels and caricatures, in which the holiest things were dragged into the mire. (c) The right granted to all of explaining the Scriptures after their own fashion necessarily led to a constantly increasing number of sects. (d) The comfortable doctrine of the unfreedom of the will and the uselessness of good works swept away celibacy, monastic vows, fasting, confession, and many other duties irksome to human nature. (e) The apostasy of kings and princes gave a powerful impulse to the propagation of heresy. The rulers saw at once the temporal advantages accruing to them from the new faith. It opened the door to a wholesale seizure of church property, to the confiscation of vast estates, and to the secularization of entire territories belonging to bishops and abbeys. At the same time it greatly increased their power over the people since it allowed them supreme jurisdiction in all religious matters. In many countries it was mere brute force which compelled the subjects to adopt the religion of their ruler. (f) The cities adopted the new creed on economical and social grounds. Industrial life had greatly developed during the last few decades. But bishops and monasteries in many cases opposed this development,

because their own interests, chiefly agricultural, were impaired by the growing industries. The Church in Germany was the richest in Europe. Almost one-third of the soil belonged to ecclesiastical bodies. In many cities the ecclesiastical foundations were in possession of the greater part of the common lands. The religious question was thus complicated by a conflict between agrarian and industrial interests. Furthermore the capitalists, living almost exclusively in cities, were irritated at the opinion accepted by the great majority of Theologians that the taking of interest was equivalent to usury. Lombard merchants and later those of Germany resorted to various sorts of subtle distinctions to represent the taking of interest as a purchase of rents, etc. All this tended to prepare the capitalists and the industrial classes of the cities for a break with the Church. As a matter of fact, most of the cities fell away without any pressure on the part of the princes. Material interests were rapidly supplanting spiritual ideals. (g) Whilst princes, cities and preachers did their utmost to make propaganda for the revolution which by a sort of stupendous hypocrisy they called a "reformation," the defense of the Catholic faith imperatively called for a resistance which was ready to sacrifice all human advantages, even life itself. Instead of this generous attitude we find, with honorable exceptions, lukewarmness, apathy, compromise, worldly prudence, if not downright apostasy among the members of the higher and lower clergy. The pastors being dumb, the flock was easily led astray by the shouters and hirelings.

Dr. J. Janssen: *Geschichte des deutschen Volkes seit dem Ausgang des Mittelalters*, vol. 3, pp. 17–152 (*Territorial Churches; Diets of Speyer, Zwinglianism*). — R. Parsons: *Calvinism*, Studies, vol. 3, p. 358. — Spalding: *Reformation in Switzerland*, vol. 1, 167–200; *Reformation in Sweden*, pp. 394–437; *in Denmark, Norway and Iceland*, 438–454. — Alzog: vol. 3, ch. 2. — Hergenroether, K. G., vol. 2, pp. 274–287; *On the Spread of Protestantism in Germany*, p. 320; *Prussia, Silesia, Poland, Hungary*, p. 323; *in Scandinavia*, p. 328; *Causes of Spread*, p. 378. — B. Jungmann: Dissert. 37, 2, *De propagatione Protestantismi*, p. 37; *Zwinglius et Calvinus*, p. 42. — Hefele-Hergenroether, C. G., vol. 9, pp. 448–689. — v. Weiss, vol. 7, pp. 743–751. — Stone: *Pictures of the Reformation Period*, M. '99, 1, p. 36. — D. J. Kolberg: *Die Einführung der Reformation im Ordensland Preussen;* also H. P. B., vol. 121, p. 325. — Doellinger: *Die Reformation* — Jörg: *Gesch. des Protestantismus* (*The General Literature on the German Prot. Revolution in Janssen*, Germ. Edition).

§ 5.

FIRST WARS OF CHARLES V.

215. First War With Francis I., 1521–26. — The union of the Spanish and Hapsburg lands in one hand and the wounded vanity of Francis I., the defeated rival of Charles V., made a war between the two inevitable. The French king laid claims to Navarre, revived the claims of his predecessors to Naples, and opened hostilities. Charles V. claimed Burgundy as his own rightful inheritance and the duchy of Milan as a fief of the Empire.

Allied with Charles was Leo X. (1521); the following year Adrian VI., Venice, Milan, Florence and Genoa acceded to the league. The war commenced in the Low Countries and in Navarre. The principal seat of war, however, was Italy. The struggle began by the expulsion from Milan of the French under Lautrec by the imperial commander Pescara, and Lautrec's withdrawal to Lyons. Francesco Sforza, the last duke of his race, was reinstated in Milan. The French recrossing the Alps in 1523 were once more pushed out of Italy without fighting a single battle.

216. Duke Charles of Bourbon, embittered for various reasons against his king, made common cause with Charles V., and was made generalissimo of the Emperor's Italian army. His invasion of Provence failed. Francis crossed Mont Cenis close on the heels of the retreating Bourbon, captured Milan, and laid siege to Pavia.

217. The Battle of Pavia, 1525, and the Peace of Madrid, 1526. — The protracted siege of Pavia gave the imperial generals time to arrange their forces. The great name of Bourbon attracted an army of adventurers to his standard. The Spanish troops under Pescara were joined by 12,000 Germans under Frundsberg and by the Italians under Launay, viceroy of Naples. By a sally from Pavia Francis I. was caught between two fires. He fought bravely but was defeated with terrible slaughter. The flower of the French nobility fell in the defense of their king. Francis himself became the prisoner of Launay, and was conveyed to Spain. He was released only after agreeing to the Peace of Madrid. In this treaty Francis gave up all claims to Naples, Milan and Burgundy; the counties of Flanders and Artois, which Charles had held as fiefs of the French crown, were made free of all homage. Charles of Bourbon was restored to his estates and dignities.

A few hours before the Treaty of Madrid was signed, Francis protested to his own ambassadors that he did not mean to keep the treaty because concluded under compulsion. After the signature he swore on the gospel and on the honor of a knight to fulfill the compact or to return to captivity, and handed over his two sons as hostages. Having thus obtained his liberty he repudiated the treaty, refused to transfer Burgundy and concluded the League of Cognac, which arrayed Clement VII., Venice, Milan and Francis I. and later Henry VIII. as protector of the league against Charles V. The

battle of Pavia and the Treaty of Madrid had awakened general dread of Spanish domination.

218. The Sack of Rome. — The lukewarmness of the leaguers who wasted their time in fruitless undertakings, enabled the Imperialists to drive Sforza from Milan, whilst Charles sent 10,000 men from Spain into the kingdom of Naples and another army of German lanzknechts mainly Lutherans under George of Frundsberg to northern Italy, 1526. Bourbon and Frundsberg united their forces in February, 1527. Whilst peace negotiations were still pending between Rome and Madrid, and a truce was actually concluded, the imperial troops mutineered, clamoring for the arrears of their pay. In his agitation Frundsberg fell down in a fatal fit of apoplexy, and Bourbon consented to lead the armies to Rome. The city of the Popes was stormed; Bourbon, the only leader who could have kept the troopers in check, fell while scaling the walls. The Pope and the Cardinals escaped to the castle of St. Angelo. Then began a scene of unimaginable horror. A horde of 40,000 ruffians free from all restraint gratified their lusts and passions at the expense of the most cultivated population in the world. No sanctity of church or convent, no dignity of position, no condition of friend or foe, no appeal of sex or age were able to mitigate the brutality of fanatical German Lutherans, ruthless Spaniards and plundering Italians. The punishment followed in the wake of the crime. In a short time 30,000 of the 40,000 who had stormed Rome, fell victims to their debaucheries, their quarrels or the plague.

Lautrec died before Naples, his soldiers perished by sickness or were made prisoners. The Medici lost Florence by a popular rising. The French were driven out of Genoa by Andrea Doria, who had changed sides in the midst of the war, and established a republican form of government under the protection of Charles V., who thereby obtained a safe passage from Spain to Italy and Germany.

219. The Treaties of Barcelona and Cambray, 1529. — When the news from Rome reached Spain, Charles ordered the court to go into mourning, and restored to the Pope all his rights by the Peace of Barcelona.

With Francis I. the Emperor concluded the Peace of Cambray called the Ladies' Peace, because Francis' mother, Louisa of Savoy,

and Charles' aunt, Margaret of Austria, regent of the Low Countries, were empowered to settle the conditions. Francis I. yielded all the Italian and Flemish claims, and Charles V. gave up Burgundy and restored the French princes to their father for a ransom of 2,000,000 crowns, 1529. The following year Charles V. left Spain to settle the affairs of Italy, restored the Milanese minus the citadel and the town of Monza to Francesco Sforza and was crowned Emperor at Bologna by Clement VII. It was the last imperial coronation of the Holy Roman Empire. In return the Emperor's army conquered the Republic of Florence, and restored it as a hereditary dukedom to the House of Medici.

From Italy the Emperor proceeded to Augsburg, whither he had summoned a diet to pacify the religious disturbances in Germany.

Janssen: Vol. 3, pp. 1–16; 122–28.— W. Robertson: *History of the Reign of Charles V.*, v. 2. — Johnson: *Europe in the Sixteenth Century*, pp. 129–137; 106–164; 172–196. — J. S. Brewer: *The Reign of Henry VIII.*, vol. 2, ch. 25. — Kitchin: *Hist. of France*, vol. 2. — R. Parsons: *Pope Clement VII.—The Sacking of Rome; Studies*, v. 3, p. 340. — A. de Reumont: *The Carafas of Maddalone.* — C. Coignet. *Francis I. and his Time.* — A. B. Cochrane: *Francis I. in Captivity.* — Baumgarten: *Geschichte Karls V.* — Wm Coxe: *History of the House of Austria.* — Dändliker: *Geschichte der Schweiz.* — *Histories of France.*

§ 6.

THE DIET OF AUGSBURG AND THE TRUCE OF NÜRNBERG.

220. The Diet of Augsburg, 1530. — The Emperor opened the diet with great tact and a spirit of conciliation. The Protestant princes presented a statement of their doctrines drawn up by Melanchthon, the famous "Confession of Augsburg," which together with the subsequent "Apology" forms the standard of the Lutheran tenets. It consists of an exposition of belief in 21 articles, and an enumeration of Catholic abuses in 7 articles. Communion under one species, private masses, sacramental confession, celibacy of the clergy, monastic vows, abstinence from meat and the hierarchy of the Church are the "abuses" enumerated. Dr. Eck and three other theologians on behalf of the Emperor and the Catholic princes drew up the "Confutation" of the Augsburg Confession.

The Protestants answered with the "Apology." Zwingli, furiously at war with Luther about the doctrine of the Eucharist,

handed in a confession of his own. Four cities came with a formula again differing from the rest. Numerous conferences and debates, all the efforts of the Emperor and the bishops to effect a peace proved unavailing. No compromise was possible in the clash of the irreconcilable principles of Catholic faith and Protestant belief: whether *divine authority* represented by a divinely-commissioned Church, or *human authority* exercised by private interpretation of God's Word is paramount in matters of the Christian religion. Luther himself opposed a union. Philip of Hesse left the diet without the Emperor's leave. The rest of the Protestant princes offered a sullen resistance to every overture of the Catholic party. Under these circumstances the Emperor published a decree to the effect, that the innovations introduced since the Diet of Worms should be canceled, church property be restored to its original destination, and Catholics in Protestant countries enjoy freedom of worship under the special protection of the Emperor. An invasion of the Turks soon offered the Protestant princes the means of frustrating the intentions of the Emperor.

221. **Campaigns of Suleyman the Magnificent.** — The Ottoman Turks again turned their arms against the Occident under Suleyman, the Magnificent (1520–1566). In the first Turkish invasion Louis, king of Hungary and Bohemia, lost the important city of Belgrade, 1521. The following year Suleyman with 150,000 men and an artillery of 300 guns attacked Rhodes, whence the Knights of Rhodes (Knights of St. John) had ruled the Eastern Mediterranean. The Grandmaster of the Order, the saintly hero Lisle d'Adam, defended the city with only 312 knights and 6,000 soldiers and citizens. 80,000 Turks fell in the trenches. But the city was undermined by the enemy; a breach was made which thirty horsemen could enter abreast. Not till then the Grandmaster surrrendered the city to save the citizens, and obtained fair terms and the unstinted admiration of Suleyman, 1522. Charles V. transferred the Order to the island of Malta. Suleyman's next attack was prompted by Francis I., who after the battle of Pavia implored the help of the Turk against the Emperor. With 200,000 men he attacked Hungary. The decisive battle was fought at Mohacs, where Hungary lost her king and an army of 24,000, among them the flower of the nobility. Archduke Ferdinand had been married to Anne, sister of king Louis. The marriage contract gave Ferdinand a claim to succession in Bohemia and Hungary. Bohemia unanimously elected him king. In Hungary a double election took place; a party allied with the Turks chose John Zapolya, prince of Transylvania,

Hungary's most powerful vassal. The Christian party raised Ferdinand to the throne of St. Stephen. By the acquisition of Bohemia and Hungary Ferdinand became the founder of the Austrian monarchy. In 1529 Suleyman again entered Hungary and received the homage of Zapolya on the plains of Mohacs. He then with an army of 250,000 Turks advanced to the very walls of Vienna. The veteran count Salm with a garrison of 12,000 held him at bay and repulsed every attack, till the approach of winter forced the Sultan to retreat. Zapolya now governed, besides Transylvania, the Turkish part of Hungary, the south and the middle, as the "slave of Suleyman," while Ferdinand ruled in western and northern Hungary.

222. Election of Archduke Ferdinand. — From Augsburg Charles V. went to Koeln where the six Catholic electors chose archduke Ferdinard, king of the Romans, 1530. John of Saxony protested against the election. He aided Philip of Hesse and a number of princes and cities in the formation of the League of Smalkald, a Protestant town of Thuringia. Luther and Melanchthon authorized the use of arms for the maintenance of Protestantism against the "Papists," including the Emperor. The Leaguers obliged themselves to stand by each other for six years in resisting the Emperor's edicts, to support John in his protest against Ferdinand's election, and to seek aid from France, England, Denmark, even Zapolya, in case they were summoned to appear before the imperial tribunal.

223. Religious Truce of Nuremberg. — In 1532 Ottoman hordes again over-ran Hungary and Austria. The Protestant estates steadfastly refused aid against the Turks, till Charles should yield to their demands. In the Religious Truce of Nuremberg all lawsuits against Protestant states in matters of religion and church property were suspended, the imperial court was ordered not to accept new suits. The states of the Empire now granted an army of 20,000 foot and 4,000 horse, which added to Charles' 52,000 men, and the 10,000 Hungarians paid by Clement VII., enabled the Emperor to appear in the field with an effective force. The Sultan thought it prudent to retire before this formidable army and gave up the expedition. Thereupon the Christian forces disbanded without freeing Hungary from the yoke of Zapolya and the Turks. Henceforth whenever Emperor Charles or king Ferdinand required the aid of

the princes against the Turks, they had to purchase it by concessions to the Protestants.

Janssen: vol. 3, pp. 162-257. — Alzog: vol. 3, ch. 1. — Hergenroether, K. G., v. 2, p. 288, etc. — Hefele-Hergenroether, C. G., v. 9, pp. 693-792. — v. Weiss: pp. 768-815. — W. Robertson: *Charles V.* — E. Szabad: *Hungary Past and Present.* — Dr. W. Traknói: *Ungarn in der Schlacht bei Mohács.* — Fessler: *Gesch. Ungarns.* — *Suleyman's Career*, Q. R., 82, 1, p. 464. — Freeman: *Ottoman Power.* — Ch. Thornton Forster. — F. H. Blackburn Daniell: *The Life and Letters of O. G. de Busbecq* (Imperial Ambassador to Turkey). — On *Suleyman: General Histories of the Ottoman Turks:* Sir E. S. Creasy, Hammer; Zinkeisen (see authorities to book 1, chap. 3, §§ 1 and 2).

§ 7.

NEW WARS OF CHARLES V.

224. Expedition to Tunis, 1535 — Third War with Francis I., 1536-38.— With the aid of Francis I. Chaireddin Barbarossa, a chief of Mohammedan corsairs, had made himself master of Tunis, whence he was destroying the commerce and the navigation of Christian states on the Mediterranean. Charles V. in 1535 took Tunis, set at liberty 20,000 Christian slaves, and restored the territory to its former owner (Muley Hassan) as a fief of the Spanish crown. Returning from Tunis, Charles found that Francesco Sforza had just died, and accordingly reunited the duchy of Milan with the Empire as a vacant fief. Meanwhile Henry VIII. had accomplished his apostasy, and had come under the influence of the new chancellor, Thomas Cromwell, who sought to join all the enemies of the Catholic Emperor in an aggressive league. The victory of Tunis, the occupation of Milan and the policy of Cromwell united Francis I., Henry VIII. and Suleyman II. in a common bond of friendship against Charles V.

Without a declaration of war a French army entered Italy and took Turin, whilst the Emperor invaded both the north and the south of France. Through Paul III.'s mediation the two monarchs concluded the Truce of Nice for ten years with a view of arriving at a definite peace, 1538.

225. Fourth War Between Charles and Francis, 1542-44. — All negotiations failing, a new war broke out in 1542 and in a short time assumed European dimensions. The time was well chosen by the enemies of Charles. The Emperor had lost a fleet in

a disastrous expedition to Algiers (1541) and Ferdinand an army against the Turks in Hungary (1542). Francis I. in 1543 renewed his offensive alliance with Suleyman II., and French vessels in concert with Barbarossa's Algerian cruisers attacked the shores of the Mediterranean, to the great scandal of Christendom. Charles' misfortune at Algiers convinced him of the necessity of coming to terms with Henry VIII. in order to obtain the aid of a powerful fleet. Henry VIII. — no longer under the influence of Cromwell — was the more willing to co-operate with the Emperor, as the marriage of James V. of Scotland with a daughter of Francis I. threatened his cherished plan of uniting Scotland with England. There was some fighting in Italy, the French gaining a victory in Piedmont. But the Emperor made his chief efforts in the north. He first defeated the rebellious duke of Cleves, Francis' ally. Thence, while Henry VIII. took Boulogne, Charles marched into the heart of France and threatened the city of Paris. Francis fearing lest Charles V. and Henry VIII. might join their forces, hastened to conclude the Peace of Crespy. The Emperor renounced his claims to Burgundy, Francis his claims to Milan and Naples, Flanders and Artois. Henry the Dauphin imitated his father's policy and secretly protested against the peace concluded by his father as not binding on himself.

226. The Smalkaldic War — Growth of the League. — While the Emperor was fighting in foreign countries, the Smalkald League became a great power in Germany. The Suabian League, its only rival in the southern states, was dissolved. Philip of Hesse, aided by French and English money, conquered Würtemberg for the outlawed Ulrich, 1534, who at once began to "reform the country," that is, to plunder its churches. New cities from time to time joined the league. Catholic princes died and were replaced by Protestant successors, who suppressed the Catholic Church in their respective countries. Thus the excellent Catholic leader, duke George of Saxony, was succeeded by his Protestant brother, Henry (1539), and by the latter's son, Maurice (1541). The Catholic Joachim I. of Brandenburg, was succeeded by his son Joachim II. (1535), who in 1539 adopted the Lutheran creed.

The leaguers made treaties with foreign Powers, secularized episcocal sees, overran Catholic neighbors with fire and sword, rejected the

General Council convoked by Paul III. to meet in Trent, and defied with impunity the imperial diets and tribunals.

227. **Bigamy of Philip of Hesse.** — The foremost leader of the Smalkald League, Philip of Hesse, was firmly bound to the cause of Lutheranism by a decision of the Wittenberg theologians, which struck at the root of Christian morality. Philip had been married sixteen years to Christine, daughter of George of Saxony, and was the father of eight children. Luther by a document signed by himself and four other theologians, allowed him to marry Margaret von der Saale in addition to his lawful wife. Margaret's own scruples against such a "marriage" had to be overcome by one of these "reformers." The unholy union was solemnized by the court preacher Melander (who had himself three wives living), in presence of Melanchthon and other church and state delegates of Saxony.

228. **Luther's Death, 1546.** — Luther's last years were embittered by violent controversies with his colleagues, by the evil lives of his followers, and by terrors of conscience. His confessions are numerous that his work as a "reformation" was a hopeless failure. He often compared the piety of the people in papal times with the impiety displaying itself under the gospel. He declared "Wittenberg worse than Sodom." He continued, nevertheless, in his last works to rave against "the Popedom founded by the devil" and to appeal to the nation "to burn out the Jews with brimstone, pitch and hell fire." Luther died in his native city of Eisleben, Feb. 18, 1546.

229. The Smalkaldic War, 1546-47. — The final victory of Charles V. over Francis I. encouraged him once more to try a settlement of the religious question. For that purpose he summoned the princes to Ratisbon. Not one of the leaguers appeared, while the Catholic estates produced abundant proofs of the intolerable treatment by the league of purely Catholic territories. Under these circumstances Charles sought and obtained the active alliance of Paul III. and the neutrality of Maurice of Saxony. To the Pope he promised to make no treaty injurious to the Church, and to compel the Protestant princes to recognize the Council of Trent. Thus prepared he placed Philip of Hesse and John Frederic of Saxony under the ban of the Empire. The army of the league, 50,000 strong, waged war chiefly against monasteries and churches. The Emperor concentrated 50,000 German, Spanish and Italian troops at Ratisbon. His chief commander was the Spanish duke of Alva. Avoiding an open battle, and choosing unassailable positions he gradually dislodged the leaguers from the chief cities of Southern Germany.

Meanwhile Maurice of Saxony, who had been promised the electorship of Saxony, joined the Emperor's cause, and conquered in a few days the whole country of John Frederic. Thus the Emperor became master of the situation without a battle. Next spring Charles V. marched to the aid of Maurice, who was hard pressed by the leaguers and completely scattered the Smalkald army at Mühlberg, 1547. John Frederic became the Emperor's prisoner and abdicated the electoral dignity in favor of Maurice. Philip of Hesse surrendered unconditionally, and was for a time retained in honorable custody. The Smalkald League was dissolved. The Emperor was now at the height of his power.

230. The Interim, 1548. — It was unfortunate for the cause of religion that Charles V. just now quarreled with Paul III. He desired to annex Milan to his own domains, and claimed a power over the Council of Trent, which would have made that august body a tool in the hands of the Emperor. Finding that Paul III. insisted on his rights, Charles' troops invaded the patrimony of St. Peter. In this angry mood he published, in the diet of Augsburg, 1548, the so-called "Interim," a sort of imperial inter-religion, intended to unite the contending parties, till a final settlement by the Council could be reached. In the doctrine of justification and the Holy Eucharist the Interim leaned toward Lutheranism. It allowed the clergy to marry and the laity to receive communion under both species. These were matters in which the Emperor had no jurisdiction whatever. Catholics and Protestants alike were disgusted with this masterpiece of duplicity, 1548.

Janssen, vol 3, pp. 258-626.— Darras: *Hist. of the Cath. Church, Pontificate of Paul III.*, v. 4, ch. 3.— Alzog: vol. 3, ch. 1, 133.— Hergenroether, K. G., vol. 2, pp. 292-308.— Hefele-Hergenroether: C. G., vol. 9, pp. 802 938; v. Weiss: vol. 8, pp. 33-111.— H. O'Connor, S. J.: *Luther's Own Statements Concerning His Teaching and its Results.*— Ch. G. Hebermann: *Myths and Legends of the Reformation:* A. C. Q., v. 14, p. 193— L. Pastor-Paulus: *On Luther's death: Erläuterungen und Ergänzungen zu Janssen's Gesch. des deutschen Volkes*, vol. 1. — L. Pastor: *Die Kirchlichen Unionsbestrebungen unter Karl V.*

Stanley-Lane-Poole: *The Barbary Corsairs* (St. of N. S.).— Vice Admiral Julien de la Gravière: *Doria et Barberousse; Les Corsaires Barbaresques; la Marine de Soliman le Grand.*—Hammer, Zinkeisen and other histories of the Ottoman Turks (see b. 2, §§ 6; b. 1, §§ 1, 2).— W. Robertson: *Hist. of the Reign of Emperor Charles V.*— W. Menzel: *Hist. of Germany*, vol. 2. — Kitchen: *Hist. of France, etc.* — Crowe: *Hist. of France; Card. Granville and Maurice of Saxony.* — Don Louis de Avila y Zuniga: *Gesch. des schmalkald. Krieges* (from the Spanish).— K. de Lettenhove: *Commentaires de Charles-Quint.*

§ 8.

TREASON OF MAURICE OF SAXONY AND ITS CONSEQUENCES.

231. Treason of Maurice, 1551-1552. — The suppression of the Smalkald League was followed by a conspiracy of Protestant princes secretly headed by Maurice of Saxony. The Protestant city of Magdeburg in its opposition to the Interim took the lead in a new and terrible outbreak of murderous fanaticism, and was placed under the ban of the Empire. The Emperor appointed Maurice of Saxony to carry out the decree. While Maurice, apparently obeying imperial orders, was massing large forces around Magdeburg, he concluded in the name of the Protestant princes an offensive treaty with Henry II., successor of Francis I. This treaty handed over the bishoprics of Metz, Toul and Verdun to France and bound Henry II. to invade Germany and to pay a large subsidy to the conspirators, 1551. The treason of Maurice was twofold — against the Empire by surrendering German territory to a foreign king as the price of foreign interference in German affairs; and against the Emperor, because Maurice still posed as his public ally. Thus began a war in the name of "German liberty" and the "pure word of God," both against Catholics and Protestants loyal to the Emperor, which surpassed in cruelty and brutality even the Peasants' War. While the conspirators devastated hundreds of monasteries, villages and towns in Middle and Upper Germany, Henry II. overran Lorraine, occupied Metz, Toul and Verdun, and compelled the people to swear homage to the crown of France. At the same time the Turks, allied with Henry II. and the German conspirators, entered from the southeast and became masters of Hungary and Transylvania, 1552.

232. The Truce of Passau. — Meanwhile Charles V. implicitly trusted Maurice of Saxony who during all this time of treachery continued to send messages of loyalty and "filial love" to his "greatest benefactor," until Maurice himself marched into the Tyrol, scattered the few troops of Charles, and drove the Emperor from Innsbruck. Retreating to Carinthia Charles V. left the continuation of the war in the hands of his brother Ferdinand. Negotiations for

a truce in political and religious matters, which should last until the assembling of a general diet, were begun at Passau, while the war of devastation went on. A defeat of the conspirators at Frankfurt induced Maurice to accept Ferdinand's proposal for a pacification to be effected in a general diet (Truce of Passau). John Frederic of Saxony and Philip of Hesse were released from captivity. Only Albrecht of Brandenburg, surnamed "the Burner," continued the war as the ally of France. The Emperor so far forgot his dignity that he drew him over to his side by guaranteeing him his spoils. With such an ally Charles V. undertook in 1552 his fifth war against France to recover the three bishopries. The expedition proved a miserable failure.

233. The Battle of Sievershausen, 1553. — Albrecht the Burner, dismissed by the Emperor, took up arms against the bishops on his own responsibility. But while marching against Saxony he met the forces of Maurice and king Ferdinand at Sievershausen; in this battle Albrecht was signally defeated and Maurice of Saxony mortally wounded. Two more defeats placed Albrecht's country into Ferdinand's hands, and sent the Burner himself a penniless fugitive, across the borders to France, where he became a pensioner of Henry II.

234. The Religious Peace of Augsburg, 1555. — The diet, agreed upon in the Truce of Passau, met after many delays in Augsburg. The following are the principal clauses of the so-called "Religious Peace of Augsburg": —

1. No estate nor any subject of an estate can be compelled by another estate to change his religion.

2. The parties included in this peace are the princes, the free nobility, and the free cities both of the Catholics and the Lutherans or adherents of the Augsburg Confession. The Calvinists were excluded from the agreement.

3. Catholics and adherents of the Augsburg Confession enjoy the same political rights.

4. Church property confiscated before the year 1555 remains in the possession of the Protestants; in future neither of the contracting parties shall injure the other.

5. The spiritual jurisdiction of the Catholic hierarchy is suspended in the states of the Augsburg Confession.

6. A clause concerning the freedom of public worship led to long debates, but was not adopted. The only rights which the princes granted to their subjects were the right of choosing one of the two forms of religion, and of emigrating without prejudice to their property and honor, if their religion disagreed with that of their prince.

7. Bishops and abbots who pass over to Protestantism lose their spiritual dignity and the revenues and temporal power connected with it, without prejudice, however, to their private property and honor. This Ecclesiastical Reservation, as the clause was called, was accepted by all the Catholic, and one of the Protestant states; the rest protested against it.

8. Violations of the peace of Augsburg shall be punished with the ban of the Empire.

After the close of the diet the Protestants obtained a "declaration" from king Ferdinand which granted them freedom of worship in the territories of *spiritual* princes. This clause was never recognized as legal by the Catholic states. Thus the Peace of Augsburg contained in itself grave injustices against the Catholic Church and the germs of future dissensions. The only parties who were benefited by the so-called peace were the possessors of confiscated church property, because their robbery was legalized.

Henceforth both Protestant and Catholic princes were guided by the maxim: cujus regio illius religio. The territorial ruler determines the faith of his subjects. Religious liberty was not only fettered but annihilated. Luther's principle of "passive obedience," the unconditional surrender of the subjects' most sacred rights of faith and conscience, to the rulings of princes, won a complete victory at Augsburg. This Peace, which was no peace, became for the German people a source of unspeakable sufferings.

235. Abdication and Death of Charles V. — Taught by a long experience the vanity of all human greatness, Charles V. resolved to lay down his crowns and to devote the rest of his life to an undisturbed preparation for death. In 1554 he abdicated the kingdom of the Sicilies, in 1555 the Netherlands, in 1556 Spain and the American possessions to his son Philip, who since the Peace of

Crespy was already in possession of Milan. The dignity and responsibilities of the Empire went to Ferdinand. He then retired to the Spanish monastery of Yuste near Plasencia. Here he divided his time between acts of devotion, advice to his son Philip II., and manual labor (clock work). He died in 1558.

Janssen: vol. 3, pp. 627-723 (edition of 1881). — Darras: vol. 4, *Pontificate of Julius III.* — Alzog: vol. 3, ch. 1. — Hergenroether: K. G., vol. 2, pp 308-314 (edit. of 1877). — v. Weiss, vol. 8, pp. 94-147 (edition of 1892). — *Charles V., Autobiography.* — K. de Lettenhove: *Commentaries.* — Bradford: *Correspondence.* — Guizot: *Francis I. and the Sixteenth Century.* — Raumer: *History of the Sixteenth-Seventeenth Century.* — Mignet: *Charles Quint, son Abdication.* — W. C. Robinson: *Charles V. at Yuste.* — Stirling: *The Cloister Life of Charles V.* — W. Fitzpatrick: *The Spanish Monarchy* (in the 16th cent.): D. R., '92, 4, p. 297.

CHAPTER II.

THE PROTESTANT REVOLUTION IN ENGLAND AND SCOTLAND.

§ 1.

THE EVE OF THE REVOLUTION.

236. English Feeling towards the Church on the Eve of the "Reformation." — The apostasy of England from the unity of the Church of Christ was not due to the intellectual light diffused by the Revival of Learning (see no. 165), nor to the opposition of the Church to the reading of the English Bible (see no. 170), nor to the alienation of the people from the clergy. This is evident from the hearty co-operation of clergy and laity in the work of the guilds, the healthy parish life of the period, the number and tenor of wills, legacies and chantries or mass foundations for the departed which benefited the clergy, and other facts to be mentioned hereafter. It appears tolerably certain from the literature of the age, says Father Gasquet, that the rise of the anti-clerical spirit in England must be dated four or five years before 1533, when the popular mind was being stirred up by the new teachers against the clergy.

237. English Feeling towards the Holy See. — The friction between Church and State and English impatience of Roman exactions was not greater on the eve of the Revolution than in other periods of English history. The system elaborated by ecclesiastical lawyers in the later Middle Ages dealt chiefly with temporal matters, property and property rights. It caused no doubt a certain amount of friction between the two authorities, and opened the door to English complaints and criticism. But the contemporary evidence of the full and unquestioned acceptance by the English nation of the Pope's spiritual supremacy is overwhelming. As late as 1520 Dr. John Clarke, who presented to Leo X. Henry VIII.'s work against Luther, protested "the devotion and veneration of the king toward the Pope and his most Holy See," and continued to say that Luther had declared war

"not only against your Holiness but also against your office — against this See and against the Rock established by God himself."

238. Weakness of Lollardism. — Neither was Lollardism the beginning of modern Protestantism. That there was a small number of secret Lollards up and down the country is not improbable. But the people as a whole were sound. As a body the Lollards had been long extinct.

239. Corruption of the Clergy. — As to the corruption of the clergy, both regular and secular, Mr. Brewer, whose intimate knowledge of this period is universally admitted, writes in his Life of Henry VIII.: "That in so large a body of men (as the religious in England) discreditable members were to be found, is likely enough, but that the corruption was so black or so general as party spirit would have us believe, is contrary to all analogy, and is unsupported by impartial and contemporary evidence" (Henry VIII., vol. 2, pp. 50–51). "It is impossible that the clergy can have been universally immoral and the laity have remained sound, temperate and loyal." "The existence of such corruption is not justified by authentic documents or by any impartial and broad estimate of the character and conduct of the nation before the Reformation."

240. Lack of Instruction and Popular Ignorance.— The lack of instruction and the ignorance of the people in matters of religion is another legend of partisan writers. Archbishop Peckham in the synod of Oxford, 1281, issued a constitution, that every priest having the charge of a flock "do, four times in each year, * * * instruct the people in the vulgar language * * * in the articles of the Creed, the Ten Commandments, the Evangelical Precepts, the seven works of mercy, the seven deadly sins with their offshoots, the seven principal virtues and the seven Sacraments," i. e., the whole range of Christian teaching. Archbishop Neville in a synod of the York province, 1466, not only reiterated this general decree, but set out at great length the points of these lessons upon which the parish priests were to insist. There is no evidence to disprove and every reason to suppose that these ordinances were generally observed. A survey of the books issued by the English press at the end of the fifteenth and the early part of the sixteenth centuries shows that the bulk of the publications were of a religious character. Primers and sermons, works of instruction on the Creed and the Commandments, lives of the Saints, popular expositions of Scripture history, instructions to parents concerning the religious education of their children, were not only produced, but were in great demand, and passed through several editions in a short space of time. The clergy, instead of discouraging the use of such books, actively helped in their distribution. Especially in the matter of images, relics, and prayers to the Saints, the people were well in-

structed. Thomas More, who explained in 1528, "The common faith and belief of Christ's Church," says in this regard: "What this is, I am very sure, and perceive it well, not only by experience of my own time and the places where I have myself been to, with the common report of other honest men *from all other places* of Christendom."

241. Catholic Generosity. — The religious state of English society as heretofore described is strongly confirmed by the Catholic generosity of the pre-Reformation period. "In the whole history of English architecture nothing is more remarkable than the activity in church building manifested during the later half of the fifteenth and the early part of the sixteenth centuries. From one end of England to the other in the church walls are to be seen the evidences of thought and skill, labor and wealth, spent freely upon the sacred buildings. It is not in any way an exaggeration to say, that well-nigh every village church in England can show signs of this marvelous activity, whilst in many cases there is unmistakable evidence of personal care and thought in the smallest details." And this often vast work of ecclesiastical building and ornamentation was, in this very period, not the individual enterprise of powerful nobles or rich churchmen, but the work of the people at large. A Venetian traveler of intelligence and observation, who visited the country in the beginning of the sixteenth century, was struck with the Catholic practices and with the general manifestation of English piety.

242. Abuses. — This comparatively favorable state of religion as far as the people were concerned, did not exclude the existence of grave abuses, especially among the higher clergy. The tendency of prelates to look to the king for preferments, to stay much at court, to occupy themselves with secular affairs of the state, the worship of wealth and influence, the struggle after power and position, with the result that able or pliant servants of the crown were promoted from poorer to richer sees, in many cases turned to a disedifying pursuit of worldly aims energies, which should have been devoted to spiritual work. The abuse and scandal of pluralities, though less flagrant than at the end of the thirteenth century was still a grave cause of complaint. Cardinal Wolsey himself held not only a plurality of livings, but was bishop of more than one see and farmed others. Every churchman of the king's council was allowed to keep three livings, every ecclesiastic in the service of the queen or the royal family two each, every chaplain of an archbishop, duke, marquis or earl — and there were several permitted to each household — might hold two benefices. The non-residence of bishops in their dioceses was another source of evil which deprived the inferior clergy of the proper oversight and pastoral guidance of his canonical superior. The spiritual work of the diocese was relegated to suffragans or commissioners in

spiritual matters. A case in point is that of Richard Fox, who though consecrated as bishop of Exeter in 1487, removed to Bath and Wells in 1491, and translated to Durham in 1494, never crossed the threshold of his cathedrals at Exeter, Bath and Wells. Besides the occupation of bishops in state affairs made them the rivals of the new nobility, who were not slow to turn against the prelates when Henry's apostasy furnished the desired opportunity.

243. **Political State of England in Henry's Days.** — The Wars of the Roses had destroyed the power of the old nobility and swept away the great families of the mediaeval aristocracy. What the nobility lost the king gained. The new peers created after the battle of Bosworth had no sympathy with the best traditions of the past. The officials of the Tudor government were entirely dependent on the king's good will, and ill-paid, and therefore only too willing to further the king's plans to better their position. The place-hunters and political adventurers among both the peers and the officials, were eager to profit by every disturbance of the religious or social order. The people who lived in the days of Henry VIII. had still a vivid remembrance, either from personal experience or the relation of parents, of the Wars of the Roses. The recollection of their horrors inclined the average Englishman to endure any tyranny rather than to imperil the peace of the country by open resistance to the king's will.

244. **Economical State of England.** — The vast depopulation of England in consequence of the Great Plague and the Wars of the Roses "led to a revolution in the system of farming. The nobles and monasteries were no longer able to manage their estates on the old principles; permanent retainers attached to the soil disappeared and the modern system of letting was introduced." This detachment of the population from the soil and from the old feudal ties which had bound them to the lords of the land, was another cause tending to destroy the power of the nobility and exalt the power of the king. Again, the dearth of the population caused by the plague and the civil wars had impoverished the landowner and thrown much of the land out of use. As the demand for wool largely increased in the beginning of the sixteenth century, the landowners, to compensate themselves for the losses sustained, threw their tillable land into large, inclosed cattle or sheep farms, whilst others turned them into parks to enjoy the pleasures of the chase. This system of emparkment caused great distress to a large portion of the population that had been connected with agricultural pursuits. Many small villages were cleared of their inhabitants, and a solitary shepherd was employed on land which hitherto had provided occupation for sixty or eighty persons. Hence a social crisis was added to the religious revolution inaugurated by the tyranny and lust of Henry VIII.

245. Scotland. The House of Stuart.


ROBERT BRUCE, d. 1329.
DAVID II.
MARJORY, m. WALTER STUART, High Steward of Scotland.
ROBERT II., d. 1390.
ROBERT III., d. 1406; Robert, Duke of Albany.
JAMES I.,
in English captivity till 1424,
murdered by adherents of Albany, 1436.
During his captivity Robert, Duke of Albany, was regent. His one aim was that his nephew should remain in captivity. Executed for treason after the King's accession.
JAMES II., d. 1460.
JAMES III., murdered in 1488.
JAMES IV., ... m. . . . . MARGARET,
slain at Flodden Field, 1513.
daughter of Henry VII. of England.
JAMES V., d. 1542.
m. Mary of Guise.
MARGARET,
m. Matthew Stuart.
MARY STUART, . . m. . . . HENRY DARNLEY.
JAMES VI., of Scotland and I. of England.

246. Causes of the Scotch Reformation. — Several causes co-operated to bring about the Revolution in Scotland, and to give it its peculiar turbulence: (a) Respect for spiritual power was weakened since the Great Western Schism, in which Scotland, owing to her political connection with France, had sided with the antipopes. (b) The Cathedrals and monastic chapters were frequently deprived of the right of election, and laymen, often mere boys, through the influence of the nobles, were appointed to high positions in the Church. Even the stain of illegitimacy was not deemed a bar to ecclesiastical advancement. (c) Many of the higher clergy, besides being intruders, were leading lives far from edifying, while the lower clergy were lamentably deficient in ecclesiastical training. (d) The people, neglected by the clergy, and uninstructed in the catechism, lacked a sufficient knowledge of their faith, when confronted by heretical preachers. (e) The wealth of the Scottish Church excited the cupidity of the needy and unscrupulous barons, and formed the most powerful incentive to the religious revolt consummated by the Parliament of 1560. It would, however, be a misrepresentation to call this wealth excessive. The total annual revenues of the Scottish Church have been estimated at 327,734*l.* This sum had not only to maintain 3,000 ecclesiastics including the religious orders of both sexes with their churches, monasteries and hospitals, but was also the chief support of the poor and afflicted. (f) The

nobility in Scotland, tied to their vassals by the almost patriarchal intimacy expressed by the term clanship, enjoyed an independence from the crown and a power over their subjects which was probably unequaled in any European country. A great portion of the internal history of Scotland is taken up with the efforts of the kings to maintain the slender rights of the crown against the constant encroachments of the barons. If the king took steps to restrain his unruly subjects, the nobles at once formed one of those powerful *bands* or *bonds* (leagues) which cost more than one Scottish king his life. It was this body of men, incited by the example and money of Henry VIII., and goaded on by a knot of fanatical democrats, that overthrew the Church in Scotland. The death of James V., 1542, and the murder of Cardinal Beaton a few years later left both Church and State practically without a leader.

T. A. Gasquet: *The Eve of the Reformation: The Two Jurisdictions*, p. 51; *England and the Pope*, p. 78; *Clergy and Laity*, p. 114; *Teaching and Preaching*, p. 278; *Parish Life in Cath. England*, 323; *Mediaeval Wills*, etc., p. 387. — M. J. Spalding: *Hist. of the Prot. Reformation*, vol. 2; *Introduction: England before the Reformation.* — C. F. B. Allnatt: *The Bible and the Reformation*, C. T. S. P. v. 5. — F. A. Gasquet: *Overlooked Testimonies to the Character of the Engl. Monasteries on the Eve of the Suppression:* D. R. '94, 2, p. 245; *Religious Instruction in England during the 14th and 15th Centuries:* C. T. S. P. v. 21; S. F. Smith: *Historical Papers*, p. 117; D. R. '93, 4, p. 886; *Henry VIII. and the Engl. Monasteries, Introduction: Monastic England.* — J. Moyes: *Some Features of Papal Jurisdiction in Mediaeval England;* D. R. '94, 4, p. 411. — *Archbishop Warham on The Eve of the Reformation:* D. R. '94, 2, p. 390. — J. B. Milburn: *English Schools before and after the Reformation;* D. R. '99, 3, 153. — *On Wiclifism in England*, Jos. Stevenson, S. J., M. '82, 1, pp. 43, 213, 484: 2, pp. 31, 225. — Maitland: *History of the English Law.* — Bellesheim-Hunter Blair: *History of the Catholic Church of Scotland; Material Condition of the Scottish Church at the time of its Suppression; Education and Art in Scotland before the Reformation:* vol. 2, pp. 311-411; *The Scottish Church under James IV. and James V. (1488-1524)*, pp. 99-132. — James Gairdner: *A Hist. of the Engl. Church in the 16th Century.*

§ 2.

HENRY VIII. AND CARDINAL WOLSEY.

247. Thomas Wolsey. — In the long civil war which had desolated the country in the fifteenth century England had lost her influence on the continent. Henry VII. did not interfere in foreign politics. Under Henry VIII., England became a leading power in European affairs through the statesmanship of Cardinal Wolsey. Thomas Wolsey, the son of a respectable townsman of Ipswich, had steadily risen in the favor of the king. When only almoner to Henry VIII. he had the management of the French war of 1513. He became successively bishop of Tournay and Lincoln; Archbishop of York, Chancellor of the kingdom, Cardinal (1515), and finally papal Legate.

In keenness of observation, aptitude for business and indefatigable labor he had hardly an equal. He was magnificent in his bearing, proud to the nobles, but just and condescending to the common people. He posed as a

generous promoter of arts and learning; but his two college foundations, Ipswich and Christ Church, Oxford, were built with the revenues of forty smaller monasteries which he suppressed for the purpose. His treaties always benefited England, whose alliance was now sought by the greatest monarchs. But Wolsey made his conscience subordinate to ambition. His diplomatic methods were those of the political Renaissance, Macchiavellian. When the king to whom he professed himself deeply attached, passed from harmless amusements to sinful dissipation, the Cardinal instead of checking, stimulated his passion for pleasure. The great blot in Wolsey's life is that in the beginning he did not oppose Henry's criminal passion for Anne Boleyn and subsequently employed every resource of diplomacy to induce the Holy See to sanction Henry's designs.

248. Henry VIII. and Anne Boleyn. — In his youth and early manhood Henry exhibited rare qualities of mind and heart, good scholarship and real attachment to religion. For these traits he was indebted to the education which he received from John Fisher, afterward bishop of Rochester. Being destined for the Church in his early youth, he acquired both humanistic and theological knowledge, and retained his literary and learned tastes, till his voluptuous life incapacitated him for higher pursuits. His education thus enabled him to write his treatise on the Seven Sacraments against Luther. The presentation of this work to Leo X. in 1521 brought him the title of "Defender of the Faith." In the political combinations which split up European politics into so many factions, he threw the weight of his influence on the side which favored the independence of the Holy See. His wife, the virtuous Catharine of Aragon, had, for a time at least, the first place in his affection, but in 1514 he openly ceased to be a faithful husband. Then followed a period of marital infidelities, and finally his true nature, the tyranny of a blood-thirsty sensualist, revealed itself. His fatal infatuation for Anne Boleyn made him the worst king of England. Anne Boleyn was the daughter of Thomas, earl of Wiltshire, raised to the peerage as viscount Rochford in 1525. His was a family of profligates. Sir Thomas and his friends formed a party that opposed Wolsey and favored Protestantism. Anne, whose levity had captivated the king, was put forward by this party to further their designs. As early as 1524 she had driven the wedge of separation between Henry and Catharine. She demanded of the king that he should discard his lawful wife and marry her, and Henry promised

to do so in 1526 or 1527. The Boleyns urged the king to obtain a divorce from the Pope enabling him to carry out his design. The question of divorce was not suggested by the Cardinal, but Wolsey fully entered into the king's plans. He considered this policy the only means to save England from a schism and himself from royal disgrace. The dispensation which Julius II. had granted to Henry VIII., to marry Catharine, his deceased brother's wife, was to be declared invalid.

Marriage *impediments* are of two kinds, according as they are based on the natural or on the ecclesiastical law. The first cannot be dispensed with by any human power – the latter can be dispensed with by the Pope. The impediment from which Henry had been dispensed by Julius II. to be able to marry Catharine, his deceased brother's wife – wife in name only – was ecclesiastical. Julius II. who acted entirely within his right, had provided for every emergency in his Bull of dispensation. Besides, he had granted to Ferdinand of Aragon an additional Brief, very clear and decided, authorizing the marriage of Henry and Catharine. The claim, that Henry was tortured by "scruples of conscience," is too grotesque to deserve consideration in a man, who, among his schemes of shameless effrontery, included a petition for bigamy to the Holy See.

249. Henry VIII. and the Legatine Commission. — Cardinal Wolsey asked from Clement VII. unlimited and irrevocable powers to decide the case without further appeal. Pope Clement VII. was a patient and tractable man even to the verge of timidity, but he listened to the voice of conscience. From the beginning the English ambassadors and agents in Rome sent reports which left no hope to Wolsey and his advisers that the Pope would ever grant a decision such as Henry VIII. demanded. Rules of procedure, commissions and dispensations without end were drawn up in London and sent to the Pope to be signed by him. But nothing more satisfactory could be extorted from the Pope and his Cardinals, than a commission to Cardinal Campeggio, to bring about a reconciliation between the king and the queen and thereby remove the necessity of a judicial decision. If this attempt failed, a papal brief empowered Campeggio and Wolsey to hear the cause at issue between Henry and Catharine, but not to pass judgment without a new commission; Campeggio, in that case, had to refer the matter back to Rome. An appeal to the Pope was always open to the queen. Not for a

moment through all the weary negotiations of six years did Clement give the final decision out of his own hand. The secret decretal commission which he intrusted to the exclusive keeping of Campeggio, and in which he defined the law in the event of the facts being ascertained, is no exception to this rule. Pope and Cardinals were alike determined "never to make a concession which would enable an injustice to be done with the sanction of the Holy See." It was not until he had spent some weeks in England, that Cardinal Campeggio fully understood how hopeless the reconciliation of Henry and Catharine was made by the stubbornness of the king. He found that Henry had his strongest support in Wolsey and in the courtiers, especially those who advocated the new creed, while the English people were decidedly with the queen.

250. Catharine of Aragon. — Meanwhile Catharine of Aragon was surrounded by spies, constantly watched like a prisoner, deprived of her counsellors, separated from her daughter, princess Mary, and intimidated by the most cruel threats to swear that she would not say, write or sign anything in her own cause. Her judges, assisted by the king, tried to induce her to enter a convent, not because this step would have set the king free to marry again, but it would have removed an obstacle to further proceedings. But to all offers and threats she had one answer, that she intended to live and die in the state to which God had called her and that she would never sacrifice the rights and reputation of her daughter. In her defense the queen had shown a copy of the Brief addressed by Julius II. to Ferdinand of Aragon. Thereupon the king resorted to peculiarly outrageous means, to obtain the original of the Brief. Under the strongest possible coercion the unhappy queen had to write a letter to Charles V. as if in her own interest, to send the original Brief to England. Fortunately Catherine found a way of informing the Emperor of her real mind, which was the very opposite of what she had been compelled under oath to express in her letter.

251. The Trial — As soon as the king found out that Clement VII. intended to call back the case to his own tribunal, he hurried on the intended trial, in order to keep the Pope in the dark, and meet him with an accomplished fact.

The hearings opened in the great Blackfriars' Hall, June, 1529. The queen appeared before the legatine court, knelt before the king, asserted her rights and implored his justice and then solemnly appealed to the Holy See; to Rome only would she make her answer.

A striking incident happened at one of the sessions, which created a profound impression not only in England but in all Europe. John Fisher, the venerable bishop of Rochester, appeared before the legatine court, stating that to avoid damnation he had come to demonstrate with cogent reasons

that "this marriage of the king and queen could not be dissolved by any power divine or human," adding that in maintenance of this opinion he was willing to lay down his life. From this time Campeggio made it apparent that he was unwilling to proceed any further and suddenly adjourned the court for three months. Clement VII. accepted the protestation of Catharine, revoked the cause from the legatine court and called it to his own. Campeggio left England pursued by the insults of the king and his creatures.

252. Wolsey's Fall. — All the king's anger for the failure of his designs was visited on the Cardinal. A Writ of Præmunire was served out against him for the exercise of his legatine authority, though he had exercised it only in compliance with Henry's express demand. His personal enemies in the Boleyn party, the dukes of Suffolk and Norfolk, the uncle of Anne, were made his judges. Wolsey himself pleaded guilty and sued for pardon. His goods were seized by the king, he was banished to the diocese of Winchester and some time after to York, 1529. Thomas More was appointed chancellor in his place. Wolsey profited by the lesson which his fall taught him. His last months were months of sincere penance, devotion and edification to the people. Before the Cardinal reached his see of York, whither he advanced by slow stages, he was arrested on a charge of high treason and conducted back to London to be put in the Tower. He fell sick on the road; at Leicester Abbey his sickness became hopeless. "If I had served God as diligently," he said, "as I served the king he would not have given me over in my gray hairs!" His last words were an entreaty to Henry to preserve England in the unity of faith, 1530.

Lingard (Am. Edition), vol. VI., ch. 1–3, pp. 1–165.— Jos. Stevenson, S. J.: *Henry VIII.; Youth and Early Manhood*, M.'82, 2, p. 348; *Thomas Wolsey*, p. 471; *Anne Boleyn*, 3, p. 30; *Henry and Campeggio*, p. 171; *The Progress of the Divorce*, p. 350; *The Fall of Wolsey*, '83, 1, p. 39.—Brewer-Gardner:. *The Reign of Henry VIII. from his Accession to the Death of Wolsey.* — Lord Herbert: *Life of Henry VIII.* — *The Defender of the Faith:* D. R. '85. 2, p. 243. — J. Morris, S. J.: *A Spanish Account of Henry VIII.*, M. '89, 2, p. 1.— Chas. Lange: *Catherine of Aragon.* — Dixon: *Hist. of Two Queens.* — Strickland: *Catherine of Aragon; Anne Boleyn*: *Lives of the Queens of Engl.*, vol. 2. — Cavendish; M. Creighton: *Life of Card. Wolsey.* — J. W. Cameron: *The Early Life of Th. Wolsey.* — On *Card. Wolsey (as author of the Divorce)*, I. K. Z. '83, p. 40.— T. E. Bridgett: *Life of Bl. John Fisher.* — M. H. Allies: *The Hist. of the Church of England; The Defender of the Faith*, vol. 2, pp. 1–20. — Cobbett-Gasquet: *A Hist. of the Protestant Reformation in England and Ireland;* ch. 1. *The Divorce.* — Paul Friedman: *Anne Boleyn, A Chapter of Engl. Hist.* — Hope (Mrs.)-Gasquett: *The First Divorce of Henry VIII.* — Le Grand: *Hist. du Divorce.* — James Gairdner: *Mary and Anne Boleyn; New Lights on the Divorce of Henry VIII.;* E. H. R., vol. 11, p. 673; vol. 12, pp. 1, 257. — Dr. Ehses: *Römische Documente zur Gesch. der Ehescheidung Heinrichs VIII.;* H. P. B., vol. 7–13. — Harpsfield: *A Treatise on the pretended Divorce between Henry VIII. and Cath. of Aragon*, Camden Soc. 1878.

§ 3.

ENGLAND SEPARATED FROM CATHOLIC UNITY.

253. Thomas Cromwell. — After Wolsey's fall, Henry undertook to influence Clement VII. by the opinion of the learned men of Europe and by threats of apostasy. Though bribes were lavishly spent to the Universities, the majority of opinions were against Henry's contention. Henry's threats of apostasy assumed practical shape in the idea of royal supremacy over the Church of England, which Thomas Cromwell, secretary of state and new favorite after Wolsey's fall, put into the king's head.

Thomas Cromwell, in his youth a soldier of fortune, then money lender and usurer, had obtained a position in Cardinal Wolsey's service, which he used to enrich himself, as the Cardinal's chief tool in the suppression of monasteries. He managed to turn his master's fall to his own advantage at the English court by joining the Boleyn party. He now made himself the heartless tool of the king's cruelty.

254. The Convocation of 1531. — Clement VII. in 1530 (March 7th) issued a prohibitory letter which forbade the king to conclude a new marriage before the final decision of the Holy See, and commanded him to live with Catharine as his lawful wife. Henry struck back by applying the Writ of Præmunire to all the bishops of England as abettors of Wolsey in the exercise of legatine jurisdiction. To escape general confiscation, the clergy assembled in convocation, voted a gift of 118,000*l.* to the king. He refused to accept the sum unless they would acknowledge him in their grant "to be the protector and only supreme head of the Church and the clergy of England." The convocation accepted the condition with the parenthetical amendment moved by Archbishop Warham: "as far as the law of Christ will allow." This clause, far as it was from the language of heroism, saved for the time the orthodoxy of the prelates. After this convocation of 1531 the spiritual supremacy of the Pope was still admitted and English bishops still received their institutions from Rome.

255. Henry's Union with Anne Boleyn. — Archbishop Warham died in August, 1532. In his desire to place in the office one who would be willing to divorce him from Catharine and allow him to marry Anne, Henry with

indecent haste made Thomas Cranmer, chaplain of the Boleyns, archbishop of Canterbury. Thomas Cranmer had been secretly married to a barmaid at Canterbury while studying for the priesthood; ordained priest, he became a disguised Lutheran; he kept his second wife, whom he had married in Germany, concealed in England. At his consecration, before taking the oath of obedience to the Pope, he swore before witnesses that he did not intend to bind himself to anything incompatible with the king's ecclesiastical reforms, nor did he consider himself bound by the sworn promises made in his name to the Pope by his proctor in Rome. Henry himself expressed his estimate of Cranmer in his own peculiar language: "Now I have the right sow by the ear."

Henry was secretly married to Anne Boleyn by his chaplain, Roland Lee, it seems, whom he assured that he had duly received the papal dispensation, January 25, 1533. The marriage ceremony took place some months before Henry was divorced by Cranmer from Catharine. To put a better appearance on these lawless proceedings, Cranmer opened court in May. Queen Catharine, summoned to appear before him, treated the citation with the contempt that it deserved. The archbishop then proceeded to pronounce the first marriage of the king invalid, and his second marriage with Anne Boleyn lawful. Henry now publicly celebrated his marriage with Anne, and Cranmer, amid the gloomy silence of the people, crowned the royal companion queen of England.

Catharine of Aragon, the real queen, was henceforth to be styled widow of Prince Arthur; she was separated from her daughter, banished from London, and sent from one royal country house to the other. Princess Mary was deprived of the title of Princess of Wales. Both were treated with cruel indignities. Catharine died in 1536, beloved and revered by every good man and woman in the kingdom. Many surmised that she was poisoned by Anne Boleyn.

256. The Royal Supremacy. — In July, 1533, Clement VII. declared Cranmer's decision null and void, and threatened the king with excommunication if he should not restore Catharine to her rights and dignities before October of the same year. On March 23, 1534, he solemnly declared the validity of Henry VIII.'s marriage with Catharine of Aragon, and the nullity of the marriage and coronation of Anne Boleyn. Before the papal decision became known in England, the separation of the kingdom from Catholic unity was accomplished by the will of the king and the co-operation of a Parliament as servile and abject as Cranmer. In the spring of 1534, this Par-

liament transferred the powers of the Pope to the sovereign. Payments which had been hitherto made to the Pope, were now to go to the king's treasury. Appeals formerly lodged in Rome were now carried to the royal courts. The bishops were henceforth appointed by the king, to him they took their oath of fealty, from him they received both the spiritualities and temporalities of their sees. An Act of Succession settled the crown on the children of Anne. The November session passed the formal Act of Supremacy: "Be it enacted by the authority of this present Parliament, that the king, our sovereign lord, his heirs and successors, kings of this realm, shall be taken, accepted and reputed the only supreme head in earth of the Church of England called Anglicana Ecclesia," etc. The royal supremacy was made to extend to faith, worship and discipline. A formal renunciation of the Pope (Renunciatio Papæ) followed in 1535. Most of the clergy who had mildly protested in 1531, now silently accepted subordination. In 1539 the supreme head in earth of the Church of England compelled Parliament to ratify the "Six Articles: Transubstantiation, Communion under one species, Masses for the dead, Confession, Vows, Celibacy." The Church of England had become the slave of the secular power.

Clement VII., in the constant hope of Henry's conversion, had gone to the utmost limits of forbearance. Many have blamed him for his hesitation; but it is to be ascribed rather to his conscientiousness in the discharge of a momentous duty. There were cardinals in his surrounding who blamed him to the very end for acting too hastily in the English affair.

Lingard, vol. 6, ch. 3, p. 166; ch. 4, p. 294.—M. J. Spalding: *The Hist. of the Protestant Reformation*, vol. 2, ch. 1.—M. H. Allies: *The Royal Supremacy*, v. 2, ch. 2.—Cobbett-Gasquet: *The Royal Supremacy.*—W. Stubbs: *The Reign of Henry VIII.*, Lecture 11; *Parliament and Henry VIII.*, Lect. 12.—Stevenson: *Mistress Anne Boleyn and her Victims*, M. '83, 1, 227; *The Origin of the Royal Supremacy*, p. 531; *Anne Boleyn, Queen of England*, 2, p. 81; *Anne Boleyn and Mary Tudor*, p. 211; *Anne Boleyn in a New Character*, p. 397.—Richton-Lewis: *Nicholas Sanders' Rise and Growth of the Anglican Schism.*—R. Parsons: *Pope Clement VII.*—*The Divorce of Henry VIII.*, *Studies*, vol. 3, p. 340; *King Henry VIII. and the Royal Supremacy*, C. T. S. P., vols. 6, 12.—J. Moyes: *Warham*, D. R. '94, 2, p. 390.—Sidney F. Smith: *The Convocation of 1532, and the Petition of Annates*, M. '95, 2, p. 473.—W. H. Cologan: *Bl. John Fisher and the Royal Supremacy*, C. T. S. P., v. 5.—*The Life of Sir Thomas More by his Son-in-Law, W. Roper*, ed. by S. W. Singer.—*Life of Sir Th. More, by C. More*, ed. by R. J. Hunter.—T. E. Bridgett: *Life and Works of Sir Thomas More.*—M. J. McLaughlin: *Sir Thos. More*, Q. C. Q., v. 3, p. 614; Hon. Justice O'Hagan: *Blessed Thomas More*, C. T. S. P., v. 3.—*Thomas More:* D. R. '79, 2, p. 261; Q. R. '96, 4, p. 329.—Baumstark: *Thomas Morus.*—J. Stevenson: *Cranmer*, M. '92, 2, pp. 65, 195.—*His Family History*, M., v. 13, 146.—J. S. Brewer: *Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, of the Reign of Henry VIII.*

§ 4.

"THE RUTHLESS TYRANT."

257. Victims of Henry's Persecution. — The great majority of the nation, the old nobility and the English people, were sincerely attached to the Catholic faith. Only a policy of terror and intimidation could force them to an external connivance at the doings of Henry. Thomas Cromwell was made the king's vicar-general — a fit lay-vicar for a lay-pope — with precedence over every lord, spiritual and temporal. He had his spies all over the land. In 1534, even before the passing of the Acts of Succession and Supremacy, Elizabeth Barton, the "Holy Maid of Kent," a nun at Canterbury, and her six counselors, two Franciscan, two Benedictine and two secular priests, suffered the barbarous death of high treason, because she had threatened the king with the punishment of God if he deserted queen Catharine. The rigor of the new statutes fell first on the two men, who by their wisdom, learning and holiness were preeminent in Church and State, bishop Fisher, and ex-chancellor Thomas More. For over a year they were confined in the Tower, where Fisher received from Paul III. his elevation to the Cardinalate. But Henry took care, as he brutally said, that the red hat should not find a head and sent Bl. John Fisher to the block, June 25, 1535. Bl. Thomas More followed him July 6. Whilst these two martyrs were still lingering in the Tower, 200 Franciscan friars were cast into foul dungeons; fifty succumbed to the horrors of imprisonment, of the rest some were executed, others banished. Fr. Brockley endured agonizing pains from excessive racking for twenty-five days till a jailer strangled him by the cord of his habit (1537). Fr. Forest, the former confessor of queen Catharine, suffered cruel death at Smithfield (1538). The Carthusians who shared with the Franciscans the highest reputation of holiness, added eighteen members to the list of beatified martyrs, foremost among them John Houghton, the prior of the London Charterhouse. The three mitred abbots of Glastonbury, Reading and Colchester were drawn, hanged and quartered in 1539. Reginald Pole, scandalized by the divorce of Henry VIII. had left England at the time, when Sir Thomas More for the same reason laid down the chancellorship, and had been

created Cardinal in 1536. Henry's hand fell heavily on his house. In 1538 he sent Sir Geoffrey Pole and others of the family, together with his own cousin, the marquis of Exeter, to the block. Reginald's mother, the Bl. Margaret, countess of Salisbury, as daughter of George, duke of Clarence, the last Plantagenet, died for the faith in 1541, after a long imprisonment in the Tower.

Henry did not confine his persecution to Catholics, Lutherans or Zwinglians were liable to be drawn on the same hurdle with Catholics to Tyburn. Whoever spoke against the first of the six articles, was to be burnt. Whoever spoke against the other five was to be imprisoned and fined for the first and hanged for the second offense. The number, however, of those put to death under this act was not great. Cardinal Hergenroether (K. G. II., pp. 339-40) sums up the victims of Henry's tyranny as follows: 2 queens, 2 Cardinals, 12 dukes and earls, 2 Archbishops, 18 bishops, 164 noblemen, 13 abbots, 500 priors and monks, 30 doctors of theology and canon law.

258. The Suppression of the Smaller Monasteries. — The next step in the exercise of royal supremacy was the suppression of the smaller monasteries. For this purpose the king arrogated to himself the rights of visitation; the papal right by act of Parliament, the bishops' right by royal writ. Unlimited power was placed in the hands of the vicar-general and his tools. These "visitors" were sent out to administer the oaths of succession and supremacy to the religious houses, and to concoct a report calculated to induce Parliament to confiscate monastic property. No more infamous instruments could have been chosen to blacken the character of the monastic establishments, than Drs. Layton, Leigh, London and others. By insolence, intimidation and bribery they induced 105 houses to take the oaths.

In due time the king asked for a bill suppressing the houses that had an income of less than 200*l*. The reports of the visitors were too viciously garbled to make an impression on Parliament; the members had to take the king's own word that these houses were whited sepulchres. The bill stuck long in the lower House, until the king one day called the Commons to attend upon him. "I hear," he said, "that my bill will not pass, but I will have it pass, or will have some of your heads." This settled the fate of the smaller monasteries. The preamble of the act which condemned these houses, spoke of the large houses as "great, honorable and solemn monasteries of this realm wherein, thanks be to God, religion is right well kept and observed." About 376 houses fell under the act, rep-

resenting a revenue of 32,000*l;* 52 houses upon the payment of 60,000*l.* were given a respite of a few years. The money, plate, jewels, sacred vessels, bells, stock, furniture, even the lead of the roofs, were either stolen by the officials or swept into the Court of Augmentation which had been organized to receive the spoils. With the monks and nuns, tenants and servants dependent on the monasteries for their living, 20,000 persons lost their homes and livelihood, 1536.

259. The Pilgrimage of Grace.— The people, stirred up by the events of the last three years, rose against the despoilers of the monasteries and in defense of their faith. This movement, beginning in Lincolnshire, and growing strong in Yorkshire, is called the Pilgrimage of Grace. Nobles and commoners assembled under the banner of the Five Wounds or the Sacred Name of Christ, to labor "for the preservation of the faith, the re-establishment of the Church, the extirpation of heresy" and the maintenance of their ancient rights. Out of twenty-four petitions which they laid before the king, these were the most important: "We most humbly ask our sovereign lord and king, that the suppressed abbeys be reinstated with their former houses, lands and estates. That he would declare the Lady Mary legitimate. That the title, Supreme Head, so far as it implies cura animarum, should be reserved for the Roman See, as it always used to be, and that bishops should receive their orders from the same." The movement was in no way a rebellion against the person of the king, it was an armed demonstration for the maintenance of their ancient faith, laws and rights. The movement spread from the borders of Scotland to the banks of the Humber. The armed forces of the pilgrims grew to the number of 60,000 men. Wherever they marched, they restored the suppressed monasteries to the ejected monks or friars. The duke of Norfolk and other nobles sent to disarm them were too weak to cope with the movement. The king instructed them to circumvent the people by fair promises of a general pardon and of a parliament at York to redress their grievances. The leaders acted most loyally with the king. Robert Aske, the commander-in-chief of the Pilgrimage, had received personal assurances from the king. Upon his advice the people accepted the royal promise with implicit confidence, and peaceably returned to

their homes. The king, of course, had never conceived the intention of keeping his pledges. A few local risings of the deceived people gave Henry a pretext to pounce upon the northern shires, and to take his revenge by the wholesale execution of nobles, clergy and commoners. The very confidence in the royal honesty was construed into high treason, for which Aske, Lord Darcy and others were executed.

The king's orders to the duke of Norfolk ran thus: "Our pleasure is that before you shall close up our banner again, you shall in any wise cause such dreadful execution to be done upon a good number of the inhabitants of *every town, village and hamlet,* that have offended in this rebellion, as well by the hanging of them up in the trees, as by the quartering of them and the setting up of their heads and quarters in every town, great and small, and in all such other places, as they may be a fearful spectacle to all other hereafter that would practice in any like manner. You shall also without pity or circumstance, now that our banner is displayed, cause all the monks and canons that be in any wise faulty to be tied up without further delay or ceremony to the terrible example of others."

260. Suppression of the Great Monastic Houses. — The collapse of the Pilgrimage of Grace removed every restraint upon the autocratic power of Henry VIII., and opened the way for the suppression of the great, honorable and solemn monasteries "wherein religion is right well kept and observed." Without any new act of Parliament or other legal cover, Cromwell and his agents invaded the houses. By the basest means they contrived to obtain from some few establishments a voluntary surrender. Where they met with opposition, false accusations, manufactured evidence, charges of high treason and bills of attainder sent priors and abbots to the block or to the shambles. Their houses were plundered and dismantled, the walls left as quarries to the surrounding gentry, and the lands confiscated for the king. An act passed in 1539 secured to the king any property which "had come into his hands by suppression, dissolution or surrender since the 4th of February, 1536." About 8,000 religious persons of both sexes and 80,000 persons dependent upon them were expelled in this "suppression by attainder." The fall of the monasteries transferred a yearly income of more than two million pounds sterling of the present money from the Church and the poor to the purses of the king and his accomplices.

The broad acres which heretofore had served to support the monks and nuns, the poor, aged and sick, passed rapidly into private hands, into the possession of the "new men." Henry's traffic in Church lands brought him a net result of 8,000,000*l*. Between 14 and 15 millions was the actual cash value to the king of the work of dissolution, exclusive of the incalculable sums realized by the plunder of all the shrines of England.

261. Plundering of the Shrines - In 1538 Henry ordered his minions to seize the shrines of the Saints in all the churches of England; and to convey shrines, relics, silver, gold and jewels to the Tower. Thus were the great historical shrines of St. Augustine, Alfred the Great, St. Cuthbert, St. Thomas á Becket and numbers of others desecrated and demolished. St. Thomas á Becket was declared a traitor and his relics delivered to the flames. The body of St. Cuthbert was found whole and incorrupt and was re-interred.

The vandalism of the general devastation may be judged from the ruin of architectural monuments, which cover England from sea to sea, from the destruction of countless works of art, from the wanton scattering of the great monastic libraries, and the desecration of the altar furniture. The costliest manuscripts and books were sold to grocers and soap sellers for a few pence. One merchant bought the contents of two noble libraries for 40 shillings. Of a quarter of a million of illuminated missals and other books of the rarest workmanship only a very few copies have been saved from the ruin. Capes, chasubles and altar cloths were turned into hangings for windows and beds or carpets for the floor. Chalices were made into carousing cups. Sacrileges on the holiest mysteries perpetrated by Cromwell's commissioners were of almost daily occurrence.

262. The Spending of the Spoils and Other Results. — The wealth sacrilegiously obtained was quickly dissipated. More than half of the money received by the Court of Augmentation was expended on secular purposes, coast defense, the fleet and the payment of Henry's foreign diplomats. A great deal was lost by the king at the gambling table. Abbey lands were readily parted with to favorites, even of the lowest class. A mistress who had presented the king with a favorite pudding, received a religious house. The college of St. Edmund with certain rectories, care of souls and all went to a cook who had pleased the king with a well-done sucking pig. Besides Henry was robbed right and left by his own agents. The pensions paid out to the ejected religious did not amount to much. The friars, some 1800 persons, were cast adrift without compensation. No pension was paid to houses whose superiors had been attainted. Of the rest only those received a pittance who had voluntarily surrendered. The poorer classes suffered most under the suppression. The splendid hospitality of the monks was

never practiced by the new owners. The easy rents taken by the monasteries were changed into rack rents. The common lands, pasturages and arable plots, of which the cottager had enjoyed the use under the crosier, were taken in and inclosed by the new landlords. By this practice, says a contemporary, the poor cottagers that always before might have "kept a cow for sustaining himself, his wife and children, and twenty sheep towards their clothing, now is not able to keep so much as a goose or a hen." The suppression made the new men rich and the poor "stark beggars." Pauperism took the place of honored poverty. To Henry VIII. belongs the unenviable distinction of having introduced a "pauper dress" and vulgarized the whole people, when he ordered the poor men who had been heretofore supported by the monks of Glastonbury, to bear a badge on their hats and cloaks as the recipients of 19 pence a week from the royal munificence. "Not only were the channels through which all relief flowed to the people destroyed, but the very fountain head of the accumulated charity of previous generations was dried up at its source when the property of the religious houses was swept into the capacious purse of Henry."

The suppression struck a deadly blow at learning and education. Most of the schools were closed without any provision being made for a substitute. The rise in rents prevented the yeoman from sending his son to school. The countless scholarships or other provisions by which monasteries and convents had supported poor students at the universities, were confiscated. The contemporary bishop Latimer, Protestant though he was, complains that in 1550 there were 20,000 students less than were within these "twenty years." At Oxford, says Anthony Wood, "most of the halls and hotels were left empty. Arts declined and ignorance began to take place again."

263. The Wives of Henry VIII. — A few months after the death of Catharine of Aragon, Anne Boleyn was beheaded on charges, true or false, of treasonable immorality. May 15, 1536, she was sentenced to death as the wife of Henry VIII.; on May 17 she was judicially pronounced by Cranmer never to have been his wife; May 19 she was executed for having been his unfaithful wife; May 20 Henry married her maid of honor, Jane Seymour. The new queen died the next year in giving birth to prince Edward (Edward VI.). The negotiations for a new marriage between Henry VIII. and the Lutheran Anne of Cleves, cost Cromwell the king's favor. He disliked the second Anne from the first moment he saw her. But in spite of much investigating and deliberating, no reasonable ground could be discovered to repudiate the contract. Accordingly Henry married her in 1539, and after six or seven months cut her off with a sum of money. For the third time Cranmer had to pronounce a royal marriage null and void, whilst Cromwell was sent to the block without much legal ceremony, but to the great satisfaction of the nation. The real cause of his third separation was Catharine Howard, a cousin of the duke of Norfolk, whom the king married immediately after

the divorce, and beheaded the following year. His last wife, Catharine Parr, survived him.

264. Death of Henry VIII. — The last victims destined to the block on charges of treason were the duke of Norfolk and his son, the earl of Surrey. Surrey was executed Jan. 27, 1547. His father was to have suffered the following day. Before he reached the scaffold, Henry was dead. Norfolk was conducted back to prison and later released by queen Mary.

According to the last arrangement made by the king and his Parliament, the crown was to go to prince Edward; after the extinction of his line to princess Mary, and thence to Elisabeth, the daughter of Anne Boleyn. With Henry died the first form of English Protestantism, the schism, a sort of diluted state-Catholicism.

Lingard, vol. 2, ch. 4 and 5. — M. H. Allies: *The Church in England:* vol. 2, ch. 3, *The Destroyer of the Faith.*— Cobbett-Gasquet: *Henry VIII. and the Dissolution of the Monasteries*, chap. 3–6.— *Original Documents on the Pilgrimage of Grace*, E. H. R., v. 5, pp. 330, 550. — *How Henry VIII. Robbed England of the Faith*, C. T. S. P., v. 1. — Gasquet: *The Lutheran Invasion: Eve of the Reformation*, p. 208). — Van Ortroy, S. J.: *Vie du Bienheureux Martyr Jean Fisher.* — J. Morris, S. J.: *The English Martyrs*, C. T. S. P., v. 4; *Bl. Margaret Pole and her Sons;* M. '89, 1, p. 514; *The English Martyrs Known and Unknown:* M. '87, 1, 524. — Pallen-Morris: *Acts of Engl. Martyrs Hitherto Unpublished.* — Mrs. Hope: *Franciscan Martyrs in England.* — Dom L. Hendriks: *The London Charterhouse, Its Monks and Martyrs; The Carthusian Martyrs:* C. T. S. P., v. 24; *The Fall of the London Charterhouse.*— Dom Bede Camm: *The Bl. Richard of Glastonbury and his Companions;* M. '95, 2, p. 347. — F. A. Gasquet: *The Last Abbot of Glastonbury and his Companions.* — Dom Maurice Chauncey: *Hist. of the Sufferings of Eighteen Carthusians.*— *The Passing of the Monk:* Q. R., '95, 2, p. 83. — Dom Fr. Aidan Gasquet: *Henry VIII. and the Suppression of the English Monasteries* (2 vol.; classical work on the subject). — Card.-Manning: *Henry VIII. and the English Monasteries:* C. T. S. P., v. 8; D. R. '88, 2, p. 243; *Suppression of the Greater Monasteries:* D. R., '89, 2, p. 243. — A. Zimmermann: *Zur Klosteraufhebung unter Heinrich VIII.:* St. v. 36, p. 397. — S. Bäumer, O. S. B.: *Der Klostersturm in England unter Heinrich VIII.* — Stevenson: *Disgrace and Death of Anne Boleyn:* M. '83, 2, 541. — Strickland: *Queens of Engl.*, vol. 2; *Jane Seymour; Anne of Cleves: Katharine Howard; Katharine Parr.* — James Gairdner: *Engl. Church in 16th Century.*

§ 5.

EDWARD VI., 1547–53.

265. Second Form of English Protestantism. — Edward VI. succeeded at the age of ten under a Council of Regency appointed in the king's will. The protestantizing party, the innovators and church robbers among Henry's advisers, after enriching themselves with new church-lands and titles, turned out the more moderate mem-

bers of the regency and chose Edward Seymour, earl of Hertford, Lord Protector of England. He was brother to Jane Seymour and uncle to the young king, and was made duke of Somerset. Somerset and his successor, the duke of Northumberland, became the political founders, archbishop Cranmer, who changed his profession of faith for the fourth time, the religious organizer of the second or continental form of English Protestantism.

The government ordered a new "visitation," accompanied by the wrecking of sacred images. A Parliament, packed in the interest of Somerset and the Council, repealed the six Catholic Articles and the special laws against heresy, and confiscated the religious foundations still left untouched by the former king. Chantries, free chapels, guilds and fraternities, though partaking of the nature of private property, almshouses and hospitals became lawful plunder. They were nominally left to Edward's disposal, but actually grasped by the greedy members of the Council. Later in this reign, when the chantries were gone, the bishops had to hand over their lands.

266 How the People were Robbed of the Faith. — The methods by which the Catholic faith of the English people was corrupted, were the following: Protestants, like Peter Martyr, Bucer and others, were called from the continent to teach the new creed at the Universities, and spread it by their publications. Innovations were first settled between Cranmer and Somerset, and subsequently passed by Parliament. The minds of the people were bewildered by proclamations from the Privy Council, issued in the name of a boy only eleven or twelve years of age, following each other in rapid succession, and by sermons authorized by the government on the "idolatry of the Mass" and other heresies. The country was flooded with translations from the writings of foreign reformers or original compositions filled with blasphemous and profane abuse of the Blessed Sacrament. The Act of Uniformity (1549) introduced the first Book of Common Prayer, in the composition of which Cranmer took the chief part. It made the English tongue the official language of the new liturgy, and swept away the essential parts of the Mass. Bishops who adhered to the Catholic doctrine of the Holy Eucharist, like Gardiner of Winchester, Bonner of London, Tunstall of Durham, and others were cast into prison, or deprived of their bishoprics. The catechism translated by Cranmer was merely a version of the Lutheran catechism designed for Nürnberg with sundry additions of his own. The second Book of Common Prayer, introduced by a new parliamentary Act of Conformity in 1552, destroyed the last vestiges of the Sacrifice and Real Presence, and was supplemented by the Forty-Two Articles.

The altars, robbed of their gold, silver and jewels, were now torn down as useless and replaced by "decent tables." Thus was the Blessed Sacrament, on which Edward VI. had still taken his coronation oath, swept out of the "Church of England established by law." Under queen Elisabeth the Book of Common Prayer, abolished in 1553, was once more issued with a few alterations in 1559. The first book (1549) may be designated as Lutheran; the second (1552) as Calvinistic, the third (1559) as Anglican.

267. Scotland and Henry VIII. — Under James V. Lutheran doctrines entered Scotland about 1525, spread rapidly to the north and found special favor with the nobles who coveted the possessions of the Church. The renewal of the ancient laws against heresy led to a few executions, to numerous abjurations of the imported doctrines and to the flight of others to England or to the continent. The long-harbored scheme of Henry VIII. to unite Scotland with England made him a supporter of the heresy which he persecuted at home. The chief defender of the ancient faith and of the national independence of Scotland was David Beaton, since 1538 Cardinal and Primate of St. Andrew's and later papal legate of Scotland. Henry saw in him the principal obstacle to his plans regarding Scotland. As the friend of the Pope, the confidant of the kings of Scotland and France and the firm upholder of the Franco-Scottish alliance against Charles V. and Henry VIII., the Cardinal's policy roused the resentment of the English king to such a degree that he sent an army of invasion across the borders in 1542.

268. Murder of Cardinal Beaton. — The English faction now gained the upper hand and threw Cardinal Beaton into prison. Arran, the regent, favored the new doctrines. Parliament accepted king Henry's proposal of a future union of Mary Stuart with the Prince of Wales. A party of nobles even signed a bond to assist Henry in the conquest of Scotland. But when Paul III. laid an interdict on Scotland, the people, who still in great part clung to the old religion, displayed so strong a feeling that it was deemed prudent to liberate Beaton without delay. He succeeded in rousing the patriotism of the country against the English designs. The parliament of 1543 proceeded against the traitors, and annulled the marriage treaty with England. The baffled faction began to plot against the Cardinal's life, and was encouraged by Henry VIII.;

George Wishart, a violent preacher of heresy, was one of the go-betweens. While English invaders burnt down churches and monasteries along the border, Wishart incited the populace to similar outrages in several parts of Scotland. He was tried and executed in 1546. Two months after Wishart's execution a party of noblemen entered the Castle of St. Andrew's, assassinated the Cardinal, and firmly entrenched themselves in the castle. They were joined by other partisans of the English faction, one of whom, John Knox, an apostate priest, received from them his call to the public ministry. From the castle, where they received subsidies from Henry VIII., they carried fire and sword among the surrounding inhabitants. The arrival of 16 vessels from France to aid the regent in the siege, forced the conspirators to capitulate. They were conveyed to France as prisoners. Among those who were chained to the galleys, was John Knox.

269. Somerset's Invasion — Reaction. — The following year, 1547, the duke of Somerset, Lord Protector of England, crossed the border, and aided by 200 Scotch nobles who had secretly bound themselves to the service of England, defeated the national forces at Pinkie Cleugh. Somerset did not follow up his success. Intrigues at home, and vigorous measures taken by Mary of Guise, the queen-mother of Mary Stuart, induced him to withdraw.

A large force of foreign troops landing in Scotland, 1548, enabled a Scottish Parliament to meet at Haddington. It formally renewed the alliance with France, and Mary Stuart was sent to Paris to be educated and eventually married to the dauphin. The English, everywhere defeated, sued for peace which was concluded in Edinburgh. The alliance with France, the appointment of Mary of Guise as regent in place of the vacillating Arran, and the accession of the Catholic Mary Tudor to the throne of England, strengthened the Catholic cause and pacified the country. It was not till the accession of Elisabeth that fresh complications with England arose.

270. Risings in England. — When Somerset returned to England he found the country in a state of serious unrest. The enforcement of the new religion and the economic revolution caused by the suppression of the monasteries were the chief popular grievances. The people rose in many parts of England. North of the Humber the abolition of Catholic rites was never

popular. In the south the whole country was in a blaze. The men of Devon and Cornwall demanded first and before all: "We will have the holy decrees of our forefathers observed, kept and performed, and the Sacrament restored to its ancient honor." They demanded to have the Mass in Latin, the Sacrament worshiped as of old, communion under one species and public prayers and Masses for the souls in Purgatory. "The imposition of the book of the new service was only effected through the slaughter of many thousands of Englishmen by the English government, helped by their foreign troops, chiefly German and some Italian mercenaries. Terror was everywhere struck into the minds of the people by the sight of the executions, fixed for the market days, of priests dangling from the steeples of their parish churches, and of the heads of laymen set up in the high places of the towns" (Gasquet). "The Oxfordshire papists," writes a contemporary, "are at last reduced to order, many of them having been apprehended and some gibbeted and their heads fastened to the walls." The social state of England was another cause of the risings in 1549. New church-lands were more and more turned into sheep-farms and the hated inclosures multiplied. In Kent the people pulled down the palings. A barbarous law was enacted against the "vagabonds," the thousands of poor people who had lost their employment by the inclosures. Somerset got frightened by the repeated risings and ordered the landlords to remove the inclosures. His own rapacity was in sore contrast with this wavering policy. Thus, e. g., to get a suitable spot for the erection of his magnificent London palace, still called "Somerset House," he demolished a parish church and the town houses of three bishops. To obtain additional materials he pulled down a number of buildings belonging to St. Paul's cathedral and six churches, and carted away the bones of the dead from their graves.

271. Somerset's Fall and Warwick's Rise. — Somerset's order to remove the inclosures, his haughty dealings with king and nobles, and his cold-blooded proceedings against his own brother Thomas, set the nobility and the council against him. Thomas, Lord Seymour, had criticised his brother and strongly denounced the greed of the church robbers. He was suspected of plotting to supplant the Protector. The willing Parliament, mainly composed of men who owed their wealth to the confiscation of ecclesiastical property, complied with Somerset's wish and sent Lord Thomas to the block. Besides Somerset's invasion of Scotland had led to a war with France, in which Henry II. undertook to reconquer Boulogne. English reverses in this war hastened the Protector's fall. The opposition found a leader in John Dudley, earl of Warwick, who had just put down the rebellion in Norfolk with bloody severity. Som-

erset was tried and forced to retire into private life stripped of office, power and influence. With the fall of Somerset the protectorate was abolished. Warwick, however, whom the king made duke of Northumberland, carried on the government at the head of the council. In the war with France Warwick was compelled to make peace and to surrender Boulogne as its price. In proportion as Northumberland's popularity fell, Somerset's hope of regaining his former position rose, and he was imprudent enough to give expression to his hopes. Accordingly he was charged with treason, tried and executed in 1552.

272. Lady Jane Grey. — The failing health of the king brought the question of succession to the fore-front. By the last settlement of Henry approved by Parliament, princess Mary was to succeed. Her succession was viewed with alarm by the Protestant leaders. Northumberland conceived the bold idea of diverting the crown to his own family, and persuaded the young king, whom education and surroundings had made intensely Protestant, to secure the succession by will to the Protestant Lady Jane Grey, Northumberland's daughter-in-law. Cranmer, who at the head of the executors of Henry VIII.'s will had sworn to maintain the rights of Mary, signed the new settlement without compunction.

LADY JANE GREY'S CLAIM:

HENRY VII.

Mary, married (2) Ch. Brandon, Duke of Suffolk.	*Edmund Dudley*, Minister of Henry VII. (beheaded 1510)
Frances, married Henry Grey, Marquis of Dorsey and Duke of Suffolk.	*John Dudley*, Earl of Warwick and Duke of Northumberland.
Lady Jane Grey . . . . m.	*Guilford Dudley*.

Accordingly, when Edward VI. died, Lady Jane Grey was proclaimed queen amidst the dead silence of the people of London. From Framlingham Princess Mary claimed the allegiance of her subjects, which they gave with ready loyalty. Thirty thousand flocked to her standard and brought her triumphantly to London. Northumberland advanced against her, but his troops fell away from him and shouted for Mary. Seeing the complete failure of his

scheme, Northumberland himself proclaimed Mary queen. She was received with enthusiasm in London. In due time twenty-seven names were submitted to her for capital punishment, but she pardoned twenty. Lady Jane Grey, the Nine Day's Queen, was conveyed to the Tower. Northumberland was beheaded. Before his execution he sought and obtained reconciliation with the Church. On the scaffold he told the people that he died in the old religion, that ambition alone had racked his conscience and led him to conform to the late changes and that the people if they loved their country should expel the reforming preachers.

Lingard: vol. 7, ch. 1, *Edward VI.* — Bishop Spalding: *Edward V.*, vol. 2, ch. 1. — M. H. Allies: ch. 4, *Cranmer's Book of Common Prayer.* — Cobbett-Gasquet, ch. 7, *Edward VI.* — F. A. Gasquet: *Edward VI. and the Book of Common Prayer.* — Jos. Stevenson: *F. Gasquet and the Anglican Prayer Book:* M. 90, 3, p. 475. — R. C. Laing: *The Book of C. Pr. and the Mass: Hist. Papers*, ed. by S. F. Smith, S. J., p. 93; C. T. S. P., v. 25. — F. G. Lee: *King Edward VI. Supreme Head.* — Jacobs: *The Lutheran Movement in England and the Reigns of Henry VIII. and Edward VI.* — A. F. Pollard: *The Protector Somerset and Scotland:* E. H. R., v. 13, p. 464. — *The Nine Days' Queen:* A. C. Q., v. 1, p. 680. — S. Hubert Burke: *The Men and Women of the Reformation.* — James Gairdner: *Engl. Church in 16th Century* (see p. 188).

§ 6.

MARY THE CATHOLIC, 1553–58.

273. The Catholic Order Gradually Restored, 1553–55. — Mary Tudor's primary object was to restore the Catholic religion in England. Under the advice of the Emperor she began to work out the religious problem gradually and with prudent caution. She herself attended Mass. The old Catholic services were again introduced in most parts of England. Gardiner and the other bishops who had in a measure atoned for taking the oath of supremacy by imprisonment and deprivation were restored to their sees. Married clergymen had to surrender their holdings. Bishops consecrated by Gardiner with the Pope's secret approval replaced the Protestant bishops of Cranmer. Cranmer, Ridley and others who had committed treason in promoting Northumberland's rebellion, were sent to prison. A number of the traitors had fled to the continent. The great majority of the English people were still Catholics in heart and soul. Mary's first Parliament, by declaring that Henry and Catharine had been lawfully married, established anew the

illegitimacy of Boleyn's daughter Elisabeth. It repealed all the enactments of the previous reign concerning religion, and restored public worship to the condition in which it had been left at the death of Henry VIII. The greatest difficulty in the case was the question how to deal with the spoils of the Church which by sales and bequests had been divided and subdivided among thousands. Julius III. at the request of bishop Gardiner removed the difficulty by confirming all past alienations of church property.

Mary the Catholic was resolved to keep none of the plunder herself. She gave up a revenue of a million pounds of present money, representing the tithes and first fruits confiscated by her father and her brother, restored all the church and abbey lands in the possession of the crown, and re-established and endowed Westminster Abbey, the Friary at Greenwich, the Blackfriars in London, and other religious houses and hospitals.

274. The Spanish Marriage. — In the interest of the faith and of the kingdom, as she understood it, Mary chose Philip II. of Spain for her husband. This union of the queen with a powerful Catholic prince and a rival of France roused the resentment of both the English Protestants and the French government. For the rest of her reign Mary had to feel the hostility of Henry II. A Protestant revolt broke out in Kent under Sir Thomas Wyat, who was but a tool of France against Mary the Catholic. The plan was to marry Elisabeth to Edward Courtenay a descendant of Edward IV., and to proclaim her queen. Mary saved her crown by her courageous appeal to the citizens of London. She told them that if she thought or it so appeared to Parliament, that her marriage would be injurious to the people or to the honor of the state, she would never marry at all. Wyat who had managed to enter London with a part of his forces, was cut off from the rest, and had to surrender.

The fact that the chief rebels under Northumberland had again risen in arms, convinced Mary of the necessity of sterner measures. Forty of the soldiers, who had betrayed their standard by passing over to the enemy, were sentenced to death. Of all the rebels of Kent, only ten were executed; four hundred were pardoned from the balcony. Of the great leaders only four were beheaded, the duke of Suffolk, who had ridden down into Warwickshire to raise the country, and his brother, Lord Thomas Grey, Sir Thomas Wyat

and William Thomas, former secretary of the Council of State, who had advocated the assassination of the queen. Lady Jane Grey, the innocent victim of ambitious plotters, heretofore retained in honorable captivity as a hostage for the loyalty of her house, had now together with her husband to pay with her life for the rebellion of her kinsfolk. Elisabeth and Courtenay, the real culprits, who wanted to deprive Mary of her crown and life, escaped, owing to the Lord Chancellor's partiality for Courtenay, with a light punishment. Courtenay was banished to Italy (died 1556), Elisabeth was for a short time confined in the Tower, and afterwards kept under supervision at Woodstock or at the court.

The new Parliament approved the Spanish marriage, the recall of Cardinal Pole to England and a reunion with the Holy See. The marriage took place in 1554. The articles of marriage, drawn up by Gardiner, now Lord Chancellor, proved that Mary had amply provided for the national honor of England. The administration of the kingdom was to be wholly in the queen, no foreigner should hold any office in the realm, and no change should be made in the English laws, customs and privileges.

275. England Reunited with Rome, 1554. — The bill of attainder passed under Henry VIII. against Reginald Pole, having been reversed by Parliament, Cardinal Pole arrived in England as papal legate November, 1554, and was received with the greatest honor not only by Mary and Philip, but by the English clergy, nobility and people. On November 29, the Act of Reunion was passed by Parliament. The House of Lords was unanimous in its favor, and in the Commons, out of 300 members only two demurred, but came into line the following day. On Nov. 30, St. Andrew's day, the queen and the king attended by the court and all the members of Parliament, met in state at Whitehall, where Cardinal Pole gave in the name of the Pope solemn absolution to the kneeling assembly and to the whole nation, and restored them to the communion of the Holy See. The popular rejoicings on this occasion were proofs not merely of English loyalty but of the people's love for the ancient faith. The revival of Catholic life progressed favorably under the guiding care of Cardinal Pole, who was made Archbishop of Canterbury in 1555. He urged his clergy, not to persecute Protestants, but to work out a

thorough renovation of spirit. The convocation of 1555 enacted reformatory decrees in the spirit of the Council of Trent. The Primate was aided in his work by the Catholic queen whose nominations to the hierarchy were inspired by the purest zeal for God's glory. The bishops in Mary's reign would have done honor to the Church in any land. The priesthood, restored to its former purity, followed the lead of the bishops. The fact, that a very large percentage of priests fell victims to the plague which visited England towards the end of Mary's reign, was a signal proof of their devotion to their pastoral duty.

276. **The "Martyrs."** — The identification of Protestantism with rebellion in Mary's reign induced the government to renew the statutes of the common law against heresy and apply them to the Protestants. In 1556 a new conspiracy, in favor of Elisabeth, nursed by France, was discovered and punished. Sir Thomas Stafford with a force of Protestant exiles made a descent in French ships on the north of England but was overpowered two days after his landing. The ceaseless agitation of fanatics at home and abroad, who glorified the rebels, branded the authorities as criminals, decried the Mass as idolatry, committed sacrilegious outrages on the sacred Host, prayed for the death of the queen in their public conventicles and spread the most scurrilous pamphlets and caricatures against the Church, the queen, and Philip, who had left England to take possession of Spain, must be taken into account in judging of the executions in Mary's reign. Of the 270 persons who died at the stake, the greater number were pardoned traitors who had requited Mary's lenity by every effort within their power to upset her government. The most prominent men like Cranmer, Ridley, Latimer, had been leaders in the political plots. Cranmer died after signing six recantations, one more abject than the other, in the hope of saving his life. When this hope failed he finally recanted his recantations.

Religious toleration in the modern sense was unknown in those days. The extirpation of heresy was, by Catholics and Protestants, considered a duty of every ruler, unity of faith a necessary condition of the strength and welfare of the state. There was, however, this difference between the executions under Mary and under Elisabeth, that whilst Mary punished chiefly disturbers of the public order under the ancient laws of England, Elisabeth inflicted the death of high treason on peaceful and law-abiding citizens whose only crime was their faith. The horrible tortures in Elizabeth's prisons, continued often through months and years, are entirely absent in Mary's reign. Mary did violence to her merciful disposition in allowing the Council, presided over by Philip, to take measures, which they deemed necessary for the preservation of the state. In these measures the Council had the support of Parliament and of the majority of the nation.

277. Final War between France and Spain, Loss of Calais. — It was unfortunate for Mary and her cause, that Paul IV. who ascended the papal throne in 1555 renewed the disastrous policy of Clement VII. by allying himself with France for the expulsion of Philip II. from Naples. The duke of Alva as governor of Naples, managed a winning campaign in Italy against the duke of Guise, the general of Henry II. He was, however, ordered by Philip II. to spare as much as possible the honor and territory of the Pope. When Paul IV. was compelled to conclude peace the terms offered him were as favorable as if he had been the victor. Mary kept out of the struggle until the insults of Henry II. and the invasion of Stafford made a declaration of war unavoidable. Philip's arms, reinforced by 10,000 Englishmen, were successful in the Netherlands, where the French were defeated at St. Quentin, 1557. To wipe out the disgrace of St. Quentin, the duke of Guise surprised Calais in January, 1558, and conquered the last remnant of England's former possessions in France. In June the French were again routed at Gravelines by the Flemish under count Egmont. The loss of Calais was a terrible blow to Mary who refused to conclude peace without the restoration of Calais.

278. Death of Mary the Catholic. — The last years of Mary's reign were marked with disasters at home and abroad. The bad harvests of 1554 and 1555 caused great suffering among the people and paralyzed commerce and industry. The holders of church property were deeply angered by the steps taken by the queen to effect a gradual restitution of the spoils. The long absence of Philip and the loss of Calais aggravated her long-standing illness; Paul IV. dissatisfied with England's share in the war against Henry II. grieved her by withdrawing Cardinal Pole's legatine powers; a terrible plague visited England in the last year of her reign.

Mary the Catholic terminated a pure and saintly life — replete from childhood with uncommon sorrows — by a saintly death. She died at seven in the morning November 17, 1558, after hearing Mass in her death chamber. Cardinal Pole died at seven in the evening. Mary's work was not in vain. Without her reign, the Catholic religion in England would probably have been entirely destroyed. The seed sown by her in union with the clergy and the better part of

the nation, gave to England the real martyrs of the following reign, and helped to preserve the Catholic faith through a long period of darkness and persecution.

Lingard, vol. 7, ch. 2 and 3: *Mary.* — Spalding: vol. 2, ch. 2, *Mary.* — Cobbett-Gasquett, ch. 8 and 9: *Mary; Mary and Elisabeth.* — M. H. Allies: ch. 5: *Mary the Catholic.* — Richard Garnett: *The Accession of Mary.* — A. Zimmerman, S. J.: *Maria die Katholische; Cardinal Pole; Sein Leben und seine Schriften* (best monograph on the subject). — *Mary Tudor;* D. R. 75, 4, p. 435. — J. M. Stone: *The Youth of Mary Tudor,* D. R. '89, 4, p. 363; *Mary, Queen of England,* D. R. '90, 2, p. 324; *Philip and Mary,* D. R. '90, 3, p. 110. — *The Personal Character of Mary,* M. '99, 2, p. 128. — *Chronicle of Queen Jane and Two Years of Queen Mary.* — G. A. Lee: *QueenMary:* C. T. S. P., v. 2. — M. J. McLaughlin: *Cardinal Pole:* A. C. Q., v. 4, p. 694. — Phillips: *Life of Cardinal Pole.* — F. G. Lee: *Reginald Pole, Cardinal Archbishop of Canterbury.* — Stevenson: *Life of Jane Dormer.* — James Gairdner: *Engl. Church in 16th Century.*

§ 7.

ELISABETH'S FIRST WORK IN ENGLAND AND SCOTLAND.

279. Elisabeth's Accession. — Upon Mary's death Elisabeth came to the throne without opposition. Archbishop Heath of York presented her name to Parliament. Although she had no lawful title, the Catholics accepted her without murmur. For if she was set aside, the crown would pass to Mary Stuart, queen of the Scots and consort of Francis II. of France. Through Margaret Tudor, daughter of Henry VII., Mary Stuart was the nearest legitimate heir to the throne. National feeling and the dread of a contest of succession united all parties. Elisabeth was in no hurry to declare her intention in politics and religion. Under Edward VI. she had conformed to the religion established by law. Under Mary the Catholic she had acted the devout Catholic. After her accession she attended Mass to please the Catholics, and forbade the elevation of the Host to please the Protestants. But since Elisabeth's right to succession could be vindicated only on the supposition held by the Protestants, that her father's marriage with Anne Boleyn was legitimate, Elisabeth very soon took her stand on the Protestant side. Her order forbidding the clergy to preach before the meeting of Parliament, alarmed the bishops. In a meeting at London they refused to crown the queen. Dr. Oglethorpe of Carlisle was at last prevailed upon to perform the ceremony if he were allowed to use the full Catholic rite and to administer the Sacrament under one species. Accordingly, on January 15, 1559, Elisabeth took the solemn oath to maintain the Catholic religion. She thus began her reign with a sacrilegious communion and a perjury.

280. The Peace of Cateau Cambresis. — On Elisabeth's accession the country was still at war with France and Calais in its hands. All parties, however, were desirous for peace. The war, which had not been of Philip's making, had exhausted his finances.

France stood defeated at St. Quentin and Gravelines. In the negotiations carried on at Cateau Cambresis, the differences between Spain and France were speedily settled. Sicily, Naples and Milan had been finally secured by Spain, and remained in the hands of the Spanish Hapsburgs until the extinction of their House. France retained Metz, Toul and Verdun and Calais. Thus ended the series of wars begun 38 years before between the House of Austria and the French monarchy.

Philip II. faithful to his engagements had refused to sign the treaty until Elisabeth should be satisfied with regard to Calais. He even offered to continue the war for six years unless Calais should be restored provided Elisabeth would not conclude a separate peace with France during this period. Elisabeth rejected the offer and secretly allowed France to keep Calais for eight years. If England committed any act of aggression during that time, or vice versa, the aggressing party should lose all claims to Calais. Before three years passed Elisabeth forfeited her claim to restoration by a flagrant breach of the treaty (no. 319).

281. Third Form of English Protestantism — Anglicanism. — Elisabeth had now her hands free to realize the religious schemes drawn up by her chief advisers. They were Sir Nicholas Bacon, the lord keeper of the seal, Sir William Cecil, later Lord Burleigh, the queen's first secretary and head of her secret cabinet, and Sir Francis Walsingham, his fellow secretary, both known for a policy of dissimulation, violence and treachery surpassed only by that of their mistress. Elisabeth's first, the "beardless" Parliament, was told in the beginning, that it was expected to carry out the queen's sovereign will. Thus advised the Parliament of 1559 reimposed on the clergy, the servants of the crown and magistrates and all university men, the oath of supremacy to be taken to the queen as the "supreme governess in matters spiritual." They abolished Mass, and substituted the revised Prayer Book, decreed uniformity of prayer and administration of sacraments, and enforced these statutes by grievous penalties. The work of Cardinal Pole and Mary the Catholic was now made apparent. The convocation of the bishops directly condemned in every point this attempt of Parliament to suppress the Catholic faith in England. Thereupon the bishops were summoned to take the oath of supremacy and to administer it to the clergy. With but one exception all refused the queen's demand. Accord-

ingly sixteen bishops and four bishops-elect were deposed and went to prison or exile as true confessors of the faith. Their sees were handed over to Protestant bishops. The bulk of the clergy at first followed the example of the hierarchy. It is estimated that 3,594 parishes were deprived of their pastors. But in course of time many took the oath of supremacy to retain their holdings, whilst in Lancashire and in the north friendly officials refrained from administering the oath.

282. Anglican Orders. — To fill the sees of which the Catholic bishops had been deprived, Elisabeth invested Matthew Parker as archbishop of Canterbury, and "through the plenitude of her ecclesiastical authority," supplied all the defects of his election and consecration. For no Catholic bishop could be found who would consecrate Parker. They were all deprived of their sees but one and even he refused to do it. Accordingly Parker was consecrated by Barlow, the heretical ex-bishop of Bath and Wells, who had been removed under Mary the Catholic. Barlow was most probably never consecrated himself. He lacked, moreover, the necessary intention to administer the sacrament, because he did not believe in church, priesthood or sacrifice. Besides he used Cranmer's corrupted Ordinal, which could not convey sacerdotal or episcopal powers. Consequently Parker, from whom *all* Anglican ordinations are derived, was never consecrated at all. With the installation of Matthew Parker the apostolic succession and priesthood in the "Church of England established by law" became extinct.

283. Scottish Affairs — John Knox. — John Knox was released by the intercession of Edward VI., during whose reign he acted as Protestant preacher in England. Shortly after the accession of Mary Tudor he went to Geneva, where he formed an intimate acquaintance with Calvin. Naturally gloomy and uncongenial, John Knox fully adopted Calvin's gloomy system. In 1555 he returned to Scotland. Here he spread his errors in private houses, and gathered a number of nobles around himself. When, however, proceedings were instituted and vigorous measures threatened against the reformer, Knox, whose instinct of self-preservation was strongly developed, again withdrew to Geneva.

284. The First Covenant. — In 1557 the Protestant lords whose cupidity had been excited by the plunder of the English churches and monasteries, signed a bond, known as the "First Covenant," in which they bound themselves to do all in their power to maintain the "Congregation," as the Protestant party styled itself, and utterly to forsake and renounce the Catholic Church, "the Congregation of Satan." Wherever the authority of the lords of the Congregation extended, the Catholic clergy were ejected and Protestant preachers installed in their place. The Congregation received new strength by the accession of queen Elisabeth in England, 1558, and by the return of John Knox to Scotland, 1559.

285. Iconoclasm. — Knox met the lords of the Congregation at Perth, just after the regent had summoned several rebellious preachers to answer to the law. The inflammatory harangues of John Knox roused the people of Perth to break sacred images, sack the churches and demolish the monasteries. The work of vandal destruction spread over a great part of the country. Among the historical edifices destroyed was the Carthusian monastery of Perth, the burial place of kings and queens, the magnificent cathedral at St. Andrew's, and the venerable abbey and palace of Scone, where the Scottish kings had been anointed and crowned for centuries. The lords of the Congregation received an important accession in the persons of Lord James Stuart, the half-brother of Mary Stuart and the earl of Argyle, who became the heads of the revolutionary movement. Burning and destroying on their way, the lords marched upon Edinburgh, sacked and demolished every religious edifice in the city, robbed the royal treasury, and took possession of the mint. Mary Stuart, by the accession of her husband Francis II., had meanwhile become queen of France. French troops were placed at the disposal of the regent, and the rebels were forced to evacuate Edinburgh, 1559.

286. War with England, 1560. — In February, 1560, Lord James Stuart, on behalf of the Congregation, concluded the defensive and offensive Treaty of Berwick with queen Elisabeth, ostensibly against France, in reality to establish the Protestant religion in Scotland. In April, 8,000 English troops entered Scotland, while an

English fleet arrived off Leith. In the midst of the sieges and devastations of this war, the Catholic party suffered a great loss by the death of the regent, Mary of Guise. Both parties soon got tired of the war. French and English commissioners were appointed to draw up the terms of a pacification. A council of state was to be formed, and a Parliament to be convened in August. This Parliament was to pass an Act of Oblivion and a general amnesty for all rebels, and to make reparation to the injured churchmen. The religious question was to be remitted to the king and queen for settlement. But in drawing up this pacification, the French commissioners exceeded their instructions. Accordingly Mary Stuart and Francis II. considering the absolute amnesty of rebels in arms and the assembling of a Parliament without royal writ, an infringement of their sovereign rights, refused their assent. The Congregation on the other hand, looked upon the pacification as a victory of the Protestant cause.

287. The Parliament of 1560. — The assembly of the estates which met August 1st, 1560, at Edinburgh without royal writ, and in pursuance of treaty terms which had never received the sanction of the sovereign, cannot be called a legal Parliament. Still more revolutionary than its meeting were its acts. By a violation of the constitutional rights of the clergy, only Protestants were chosen Lords of the Articles, on whom the duty of introducing all measures devolved. The first measure thus introduced and passed — directly against the treaty of pacification — was the adoption of a Calvinistic profession of faith. Three further acts abolished forever the jurisdiction of the Pope, repealed all former statutes in favor of the Catholic Church, and made either hearing or saying Mass in future punishable for the first offense by confiscation and bodily punishment, for the second by banishment, and for the third by death. The Parliament of 1560 concluded its work by an act of confiscation of the property of the Church.

The blow came not from the people but from the aristocracy. The attachment of the people to the old faith was unmistakably shown. Thirty years after the revolutionary Parliament half of the parish churches were still in the hands of the Catholics. For years Mass continued to be said in the burnt and blackened ruins of churches and monasteries. In 1580 a few

Benedictine monks still kept watch by the shrines of St. Margaret and St. David at Dunfermline. But it was in vain for the people to attempt to stem the tide of brute force. Gradually nearly all the churches were put into the hands of Calvinist preachers. The time came when, no priests being left to offer Mass, hear confessions and instruct the children, the people were absorbed into the new system.

Lingard: vol. 7, ch. 4, *Elisabeth.* — Spalding, vol. 2, ch. 3, *Elisabeth, The Anglican Church established by law;* ch. 4, *Mary and Elisabeth compared;* ch. 9, *Reformation in Scotland; John Knox.* — M. H. Allies: *Elisabeth,* pp. 131-154. — Cobbett-Gasquet: ch. 9, p. 217. — Spillmann: *Die Englischen Martyrer unter Elisabeth.* — Prothero: *Statutes and Constitutional Documents.* — Jessop: *One Generation of a Norfolk House* — Bridgett: *Queen Elisabeth and the Catholic Hierarchy.* — Lee: *The Church under Elisabeth.* — Jos. Stevenson: *The Ecclesiastical Policy of Elisabeth,* M. '93, 3, p. 24. — H. N. Birt: *The Deprivation of the Clergy in Elisabeth's Reign:* D. R. 1900, 7, p. 25. — *Le Baron Alphonse de Ruble: Traité de Cateau Cambrésis.* — *General Histories of France and England.* — Cardinal Wiseman: *The Anglican Claim of Apostolic Succession:* C. T. S. P. v. 24. — Mr. Sergeant Bellasis: *Was Barlow a Bishop?* C. T. S. P. v. 6. — F. S. Smith, S. J.: *Rome's Witness against Anglican Orders; Historical Papers.* — Hutton: *The Anglican Ministry.* — Dr. F. G. Lee: *Validity of Anglican Orders.* — Canon Estcourt: *Question of Anglican Ordination.*

A. Bellesheim-O. Hunter Blair: *History of the Catholic Church of Scotland,* vol. 2, ch. 5: *From the Death of Cardinal Beaton to the Suppression of the Catholic Religion* — *Acts of the Parliament of Scotland,* 1560-1711 (11 vols.). — James Walsh: *History of the Cath. Church in Scotland* — Jos. Stevenson, S. J.: *Scotland and Rome.* — A. Wilmot: *The Story of the Scottish Reformation.* — Fr. Brandes: *Johann Knox, der Reformator Schottlands.* — G. F. S. Gordon: *Monasticon: An Account of all the Abbeys, Priories, Collegiate Churches and Hospitals in Scotland at the Reformation.*

CHAPTER III.

PROTESTANT REVOLUTION AND CATHOLIC REVIVAL.

§ 1.

EFFECTS OF THE PROTESTANT REVOLUTION.

288. Effects on Public and Private Morality — Luther's Testimony. — By corrupting and destroying the faith of Christ, the religious Revolution undermined to a great extent the basis of Christian morality, and severed the bonds of law, order and discipline. Luther's own testimony suffices to establish this fact. "Men are nowadays more covetous, more hard-hearted, more corrupt, more licentious and more wicked than of old under the Papacy." "As soon as our gospel began, decency and modesty were done away with and everybody wished to be perfectly free to do whatever he liked." "After one devil (popery) has been driven out of us seven worse ones have come down upon us, as is the case with princes, lords, nobles, citizens and peasants." "Drunkenness has now come down upon us like a deluge." "The people look upon the gospel as a doctrine which teaches them to eat and drink. Such are the thoughts of almost everybody from the lowest to the highest." "The people are like pigs, so to speak, dead and buried in constant drunkenness." "I have almost abandoned all hope for Germany, so universally has avarice, usury, tyranny, disunion, and the whole host of untruth, wickedness and treachery, as well as disregard of the word of God, and the most unheard of ingratitude, taken possession of the nobility, the courts, the towns and the villages." So Luther wrote, in 1541, when in the height of his triumph. "I am tired of this hideous Sodom. All the good which I had hoped to effect has vanished away. There remains naught but a deluge of sin and unholiness, and nothing is left for me but to pray for my discharge" (1542). A few months before his death he wrote to his wife: "Let us but fly from this Sodom! I will wander through the world and beg my bread from door to door rather than embitter and disturb my poor old last days by this spectacle of the disorder of Wittenberg, and the fruitlessness of my bitter toil in its service."

289. Other Testimonies. — "In these latter times the world has taken to itself a boundless license. Very many are so unbridled as to throw off every bond of discipline, though at the same time they pretend that they

have faith." "Never in the days of our fathers has there existed such gluttony as exists now and is daily on the increase." "The morals of the people, all that they do and all that they neglect to do, are becoming every day worse. Gluttony, debauchery, licentiousness, wantonness, are gaining the upper hand more and more among the people, and in one word, every one does just as he pleases." (Melanchthon.) "The people as soon as they know how to attack our adversaries, believe that they are perfect Christians. Meanwhile there is nowhere to be seen modesty, charity, zeal or ardor for God's glory, and in consequence of our conduct God's holy name is everywhere subjected to horrible blasphemies." (Bucer.) "Nobody cares to instruct his child, his servant, his maid, or any of his dependents in the word of God or His fear; and thus our young generation is the very worst that ever existed." (Althammer.) "The children are habituated to debauchery by their parents, and thus comes an endless train of diseases, seductions, tumults, murders, robberies and thefts, which unhappily, owing to the state of society, are committed with security. And the worst of all is, that they are not ashamed to palliate their conduct by the examples of Noah, Lot, David and others." (Culmann.) "Take any class you please, high or low, you will find all equally degenerate and corrupt. What is more, there is no longer any social honesty to be found among the people. The majority persecute the gospel and cling to the old idolatry. The rest who have received God's word and gospel, are lawless, insensible to instruction, hardened in their old sinful life, as is evident from the adultery, usury, avarice, lying, cheating and manifold wickedness which prevail." (Dietrich.) There is one branch of morality in which the repulsive teaching of Luther and his adherents proved palpably and universally demoralizing. His assertion that the keeping of the sixth commandment of God was physically impossible and similar doctrines were inculcated by Luther chiefly in his German tracts and sermons addressed to the whole people, with moral consequences which cannot be further described. Proofs of this general demoralization in the form of official reports from every Lutheran city and district of Germany abound, and may be seen in Doellinger's "Reformation" and Janssen's "History of the German People." John Belz, a Lutheran minister in Thuringia, could write in 1566: "If you would find a multitude of brutal, coarse, godless people, among whom every species of sin is every day in full career, go into a city where the holy gospel is taught, and where the best preachers are to be met, and there you will be sure to find them in abundance. To be pious and upright is nowadays held, if not to be a sin, at least a downright folly; and from many pulpits it is proclaimed, that good works are not only unnecessary, but hurtful to the soul."

290. Crimes and Criminal Courts. — The statistics of crime give a terrible insight into the social state of Germany in the period of the Revolution. At Stralsund, within 33 years, from 1554–1587, 167 cases of murder or manslaughter are on record, 137 persons were publicly whipped or banished or

both for divers other crimes, 18 strung on the wheel, 7 burned at the stake, 2 buried alive and one legally drowned. Francis Schmid, the hangman of Nürnberg, executed 361 persons and inflicted bodily punishments, public whippings, cutting off of ears or fingers on 346 others. Among the murderers were criminals who had killed 3, 5, 8 and 20 persons. The Chronicle of Joachim of Wedel-Wedel in Pomerania, records under date of January 17, 1591, the execution of a highway robber, who had confessed to the murder of his six children and of 964 other persons. On September 16 of the same year another criminal was executed who had murdered 544 persons. Criminal judges were helpless in the face of this social dissolution, though they applied the torture far beyond the Carolina, the harsh penal code of Charles V., and racked alike criminals and innocent persons.

291. Witchcraft Trials. — The trials for witchcraft, more than any others, sent thousands upon thousands of innocent victims to the stake. Down into the 13th century the Church had dealt mildly with persons guilty of superstition, confining herself to instruction and disciplinary punishments without handing them over to the secular arm. The civil law proceeded with the stake against sorcerers and witches or malignant persons who gravely injured others by superstitious means if the external injury was proved. But in the course of the thirteenth century the Church applied severer means, because the superstitious belief in demoniac influences rapidly spread to the injury of social order, owing to the Albigensian and Waldensian sectaries who represented the demon as an eternal and independent principle or god. Whilst, then, the systematic prosecution of witches was a product of the pre-reformation period, it was greatly augmented by the Protestant Revolution. It was Protestantism that gave a far more fatal spread and significance to superstition. In proportion as the true faith, the God-revealed truth, was wantonly corrupted, the grossest forms of superstition took possession of the deserted field. Throughout his career Luther had constantly to do with the devil. He often fancied to see him and to dispute with him, he ascribed to him all his reverses, delivered to him all his enemies. He spoke, wrote and preached of him, especially in his later years. He inflamed the public mind with all the phantoms and illusions of popular superstition, and advocated without mercy or discretion the most far-reaching persecution of supposed sorcerers and witches. Melanchthon, Bucer and other leaders of revolt shared the same superstitions. All mysterious or unexplained phenomena in nature and human life were ascribed to demoniac operations. The literature, books, pamphlets, periodicals of the times teem with lurid descriptions and gruesome particulars of possessions, conjurations, compacts with the devil and sorceries. The devil played an engrossing part on the stage and in the works of plastic art. Innumerable wayfarers, magicians, necromancers, wonder-doctors, conjurers, wizards, charmers, soothsayers, astrologers, devil-catchers, ox-bone sellers, philtermixers, crystallomancers and other purveyors to the morbid craze, traveled

from town to town, and village to village. It is amply proved that in the frightful demoralization of the period large societies of criminals held their secret meetings, carried on unspeakable orgies, used the most fantastic mixtures, powders, salves and narcotic preparations to invoke the devil and to obtain his aid in the perpetration of abnormal vice, or in the gratification of hatred and vengeance. Many witch trials were nothing else but trials of unnatural vice, of adultery, robbery and murder. But far greater was the number of innocent victims, disturbed by the moral contagion, especially women, nervous, epileptic, hysterical persons, who were sacrificed to the malice, avarice or hatred of greedy relatives, worthless accusers, and reprobate judges. The criminal procedure degenerated into a horrid, gigantic and ceaseless grinding mill of judicial murders. The fearful delusions of witchcraft and witch persecution seized both Catholic and Protestant countries, but with a difference. In the period of 1520 to 1570 very few records of witch trials exist in Catholic countries, though there were very many in Protestant countries. While in the next fifty years some Catholic territories were relatively spared, the burning of witches raged in the Catholic dioceses of Trier (1586–1591), Bamberg and Würzburg (1626–1631). In Trier 368 persons were burnt in 22 towns and villages, in the territory of Bamberg 600 (official records mention 285), and in that of Würzburg, 900. In Lorraine the Catholic judge Remigius alone in the space of 15 years sentenced 950 persons to death. The famous Protestant jurist and judge Carpzov in electoral Saxony signed approximately 20,000 death sentences. Catholic princes, bishops and abbots gradually put a stop to the trials. Abbot Schwalbach of Fulda sent his judge to the block. Protestant and Catholic theologians and jurists attacked in their writings the whole wicked system of persecution. Foremost among them stood the Jesuit Frederic of Spe. As confessor of the victims in Paderborn he had gained a practical insight into the iniquity of these trials. His cautio criminalis, published in 1631, gave the death blow to these processes. The last witch burnt in Europe was a girl of 17 years, in the Protestant canton of Glarus, 1783.

292. Outside of Germany. — In Italy witch trials occurred only in the southern valleys of the Alps, around the lake of Como, besides a few cases in Venice. In Rome no witch was ever burnt. In Spain the persecution was confined to one place, Logroño, 1610. In France the punishment of socerers and witches was in the hands of the Parliaments. Twenty-seven points of the vulgar belief in witchcraft were rectified by the Sorbonne in 1398. In 1459 a great persecution broke out at Arras. But through the influence of the clergy nearly all were acquitted, only six burnt. In England no laws or trials against witches existed in Catholic times. They were introduced by Elizabeth, 1559. One of the most furious witch-baiters was James VI. of Scotland and I. of England, who

attempted a scientific defense of his proceedings in his Daemonologia, 1591. He was still surpassed in cruelty by the fanatical Puritans of Cromwell' Commonwealth. Sporadic cases occurred till 1712. Two Puritan preachers Cotton Mather and Parris, transplanted the persecution of witches to Massachusetts (Salem), 1691–93; where twenty persons fell victims to the popular craze. In Scotland, where in Catholic days, before 1563, laws against witches were unknown, they were introduced by the Calvinist clergy; they remained in force till 1722, and were legally abolished only in 1773.

293. Private Judgment. — The statement that Protestantism invented the principle of private judgment, is erroneous. Private judgment as opposed to the infallible teaching of Christ's Church was at the root of all heresies. Protestantism itself was not the author but the offspring of private judgment, which in the development of the new religion worked like a disruptive force. One reformation sprang from the other. Zwinglians, Calvinists, Anabaptists, Syncretists, Anglicans, Puritans, Methodists, Quakers, Swedenborgians, and other sects by the hundred, sprang from the self-destroying principle of private interpretation. They separated from one another, ridiculed, cursed and persecuted one another, and were one only in their hatred of the Catholic Church. The much-vaunted freedom of conscience as exhibited in history, was nothing but a narrow-minded monopoly of one sect against all the others, and of all against the Catholic faith. Luther's freedom of conscience is best expressed in his own words: "I, Martin Luther, am your apostle and evangelist; whosoever refuses to accept my teaching, belongs to the lowest abyss of hell." Evangelium sitit sanguinem: "The gospel thirsts for blood," was Zwingli's version. Calvin wanted a general tribunal of inquisition "to extirpate the race of heretics" — i. e., non-Calvinists — "from the face of the earth."—When the leaders of the religious revolution in their eagerness to overthrow the authority of the Church, placed the Bible without note or comment in the hands of all, they unchained two evils of which the world is still suffering, fanaticism and religious indifferentism.

294. Fanaticism and Indifferentism. — A few examples must suffice. The private judgment of Thomas Münzer found in the Scriptures that titles of nobility and private estates were impious usurpations, and forthwith proceeded to extirpate the impious with fire and sword. John of Leyden found in Holy Writ the sanction of polygamy and communism and forthwith carried out his program in Münster. It was especially Calvin's private judgment, gloomy beyond measure, and destroying all individual liberty and of necessity involving religious persecution, which led to a fatalistic spirit most dangerous both to private morals and to the peace of nations. The ruthless iconoclasm, the sacrileges and blasphemies, committed hundreds of times, in thousands of places, during a century of fanatical outbreaks of the Calvin-

ists in Germany, the Huguenots in France, the Gueux in the Netherlands, the Puritans in England and especially in Ireland, were the effects of this spirit. (Book III. of this volume.) Still more mischievous and destructive than the fanaticism of the sects was the infidelity and religious indifferentism for which modern society is indebted to the Protestant Revolution. Irreligion and indifferentism began to show themselves in the very century which gave rise to Protestantism, acquired in the course of time a wide diffusion, penetrated all sciences, permeated all literature and art, corrupted the very language of the dictionaries, and endangered all the conquests which Christian civilization had gained through so many ages. Reflecting and independent minds whom Protestantism had deprived of the guidance of the Church, became disgusted with the contradictions of the ever-increasing sects. They either returned to the Church, or easily passed from Protestantism to Deism, the mere acknowledgment of a God on philosophical grounds, and from Deism to Atheism and Materialism. From the middle of the seventeenth century this spirit of rationalism assumed an alarming aspect, first in the guise of Socinianism, and later dropping the mask of a religious denomination, under its own avowed name of irreligion, free thought, atheism and materialism. The final outcome was the Voltairianism of the 18th, and the wide-spread paganism of the 19th century. (For the development of this downward tendency see vol. III., nos. 157–162.)

295. **Political Effects.** — The Protestant Revolution destroyed the unity of Christendom by which the different nations of Catholic Europe had been united into one family. In this Christian Republic the law of Christ, the spiritual guidance of a common Father, and a recognized code of international order, had ruled families, communities, guilds and states. The Revolution severed all the bonds of law, order, discipline, loyalty, and patriotism, and put in their place violence, anarchy, treason, rebellion, regicide, and finally the Social Revolution. "The Reformation was a Revolution in its most terrible form." "By the ecclesiastical Revolution everything was called into question at one blow, first in the thoughts of men, and with incredible rapidity in all institutions, order and discipline." (Droysen.) "The Reformation was the deepest source of all our evils; from that event date all our misfortunes. All the political impotence of Germany (from 1550 to 1850), the threatening revolutionary outbreaks, nearly all the dissensions of the last century have their real cause in the religious Revolution." (Böhmer in 1849.) In the Reformation the national unity of Germany was rent asunder first in the minds of the people; in the thirty years' war the moral disruption of the German nation was externally accomplished. (Leo.) Municipal liberty, the privileges of guilds, the rights of the peasant, shared the same fatal destruction, in Germany, Scandinavia, the Netherlands, England, Scotland and Ireland. Ireland was reduced to a state of helpless slavery by triumphant Protestantism. All the risings, treasons and rebel-

lions during the next 150 years, of the Independents and Levellers in England, the Covenanters of Scotland, the French Huguenots and Dutch Gueux, the Hungarian malcontents, the Polish dissidents, the German Calvinists, based their revolutionary claims directly on the Protestant "gospel." The tendencies, principles and massacres of the Puritan Revolution in England and the infidel reaction under the last Stuarts were the forerunners on a smaller scale of the French Revolution. The denial of the principle of authority in the Church were the logical premises of the denial of State authority. "The development of revolutionary State theories were the necessary, the inevitable consequences of the Reformation." (Leo.)

(The facts in detail will be given in Book III. of this volume.)

Johannes Janssen: *Geschichte des deutschen Volkes*, vol. 4 (*on the General State of the German People from 1555–1580*); vol. 5 (*on the Times before the Thirty Years' War*); vol. 6 (*on Art and Literature, and Witchcraft in Literature*); vol. 7 (*on Schools and Universities; Culture and Science*); vol. 8 (*on the Economical, Social and Moral State of the People; on Witchcraft and Witch Trials, down to the Thirty Years' War*). N. B.—An exhaustive literature of and on the period is given in vol. 4, pp. XVIII.–XXXI.; vol. 5, pp. XXV.–XLIII.; vol. 6, pp. XV.–XXXI.; vol. 7, p. XXVIII., p. XLVII.; 8 vol., pp. XXVIII.–LV.—J. Doellinger: *Die Reformation ihre innere Entwicklung und ihre Wirkungen im Umfange des luth. Bekenntnisses*, 3 volumes; (only Protestant authors quoted.)—M. J. Spaulding, D. D.: *The Hist. of the Protestant Reformation*, vol. 1; *Influence of the Reformation on Religious Liberty*, ch. 12; *on Civil Liberty*, ch. 13; *on Civil and Religious Liberty at Geneva*, ch. 14; *on Literature*, ch. 15; *on Civilization*, ch. 16.—James Balmes: *Protestantism and Catholicity compared in their Effects on the Civilization of Europe.*—Cobbett-Gasquet: *Hist. of the Reformation.*—G. D. Wolf: *What did the Reformation Reform:* A. C. Q., v. 9, p. 127.—*Foreign and English Reformation:* C. T. S. P., vol. 7.—*On Effects of the Reformation:* Katholik., vol. 7, p. 341; H. P. B., v. 2, 306, etc.

§ 2.

THE CATHOLIC REVIVAL.

296. State of the Catholic People in Germany in the Revolution Period.—The frightful demoralization of the Revolution period was by no means confined to the countries which had openly adopted Lutheranism, but entered and pervaded to a most alarming extent the Catholic territories, so that in the middle of the sixteenth century Protestant Germany was hardly confronted by a really Catholic Germany. There were grave reasons to fear that even Bavaria, Austria, and the spiritual principalities would be lost to the Church. In Austria only one-eighth of the population was actively Catholic. The Catholic princes in the first half century of the Revolution were weak and helpless, and even the better ones too much engaged in warding off attacks to find time for building up. With a few honorable exceptions, the bishops, mostly younger sons of noble houses, were sunk in worldly pursuits and pleasures. In 1530 the two most powerful prelates of Germany, Archbishop Albrecht of Mainz, and Archbishop Herman of Koeln, were looked upon as "half evangelicals." Prince Bishop Eric of Paderborn

assisted at the marriage of an escaped nun. Ernst of Bavaria, bishop of Passau and Archbishop of Salzburg, secretly married a young lady of noble birth. In many dioceses the majority of the clergy openly violated the laws of celibacy. With celibacy the rest of the priestly duties were neglected, and the unfaithful shepherds, despised by the people, destroyed with their own authority the authority of the Church. There was an enormous decrease in the number of aspirants to the priesthood. In the middle of the century 1,500 parishes, then much larger than now, were deprived of all pastoral care. Monasteries and universities shared the widespread corruption. The bad example of the Superiors, and the lack of pastoral care was reflected in the general demoralization of the people. Under Catholic forms a latent Protestantism spread far and wide, and was more difficult to combat than open apostasy. Hence the Catholic revival was of necessity slow and gradual, not so effective in its earlier stages as the indefatigable champions of the Catholic reform desired.

297. The Papacy. — The Catholic Revival was effected by the Papacy, the Council of Trent, the labors of apostolic men, the foundation of new Orders and Congregations, especially the Society of Jesus, and a splendid array of contemporary and post-Tridentine Saints. The real reform movement took its rise in Spain and Italy. In the days of Alexander VI. when the Popes were immersed in secular interests, a reform wholly within the lines of Catholic doctrine and discipline had been inaugurated under Isabella and Ferdinand, through the energy and devotion of Cardinal Ximenes. A school of theologians had been formed, imbued with the doctrine of St. Thomas Aquinas, whose members united solid learning with a life of purity and zeal. From Spain this renewed vigor of the Church soon reached over to Italy under the auspices of Adrian VI. who for a time had been regent in Spain. The aim of these true reformers was to bring the doctrine of Christ to bear on the life and conduct of clergy and laity alike without change of dogma.

In Germany Adrian and his successors were supported by Cardinal Aleander and a number of courageous theologians like Dr. Eck, Cochlaeus, Emser and others. The Catholic leagues of German bishops and princes began to introduce reforms in their own territories. The wars which distracted Christendom during the Pontificate of Clement VII. and his unfortunate secular policy prevented him from carrying the work of reconstruction beyond the boundaries of Italy. Paul III. inaugurated the correction of abuses on a

grander scale. Eminent churchmen like the Cardinals Contarini, Sadolet, Reginald Pole, Caraffa, were employed abroad as legates, at home in drawing up reformatory proposals for the use of the coming Council, the papal court and the offices connected with it. The greatest work of Paul III. was the summoning of the Council of Trent.

298. New Religious Orders. — Whilst the mediaeval Orders of monks and friars, Benedictines, Cistercians, Premonstratensians, Franciscans, Capuchins, Recollects, were active in reviving the ancient fervor of their rules, new Orders sprang up adapted to the changed necessities of the times. The Theatines, founded by St. Cajetanus, 1524, devoted themselves to preaching, to the administration of the Sacraments, the care of the sick and the reformation of the secular clergy; the Barnabites founded in 1532 to the instruction of the people and to works of charity, the Lazarists founded by St. Vincent of Paul to home and foreign missions, and the sisterhoods organized by the same apostle of charity to the alleviation of every form of human suffering (Sisters of Charity). The Order, however, that was to play the greatest part in the work of true reform and education and the conversion of heathen nations was the Society of Jesus, founded by St. Ignatius of Loyola.

Ignatius (Don Inigo Lopes Ricalde y Loyola) was born in 1491 at Loyola, a castle in northern Spain. Having been wounded at the siege of Pampeluna, 1521, he left court and army, and retired to Manresa. Here he wrote the Spiritual Exercises (Retreat). After a pilgrimage to Jerusalem he began his studies at the age of 33 in Alcala and Salamanca. At Paris, where he became Master of Philosophy, and finished his theological studies, he gathered his first companions around him, St. Francis Xavier, Jacob Lainez, Lefevre and others, all young men, eminent for learning and piety. With these he laid the foundation of a new apostolic Order in the church of Montmartre, near Paris, 1534. In 1540 Paul III. approved the Order under the name of "Society of Jesus." Ignatius was chosen its first General, and at the bidding of Paul III. wrote the 10 books of its Constitutions. He alone is the author of this masterpiece of organization. At his death, 1556, the Society numbered over 1,000 members in 100 houses, divided into 12 provinces. The Society is ruled by a General who is elected for life in the General Congregation, the legislative body of the Order. A number of colleges and residences form a Province, governed by a Provincial. A number of provinces form an Assistency, and have a representative or

assistant near the general. The aim of the "Company of Jesus" expressed in its motto, *Ad majorem Dei gloriam*, is to work for the honor of God and the salvation of men, and comprises, besides the ordinary labors of the apostolic ministry, home and foreign missions and the higher education of youth. The number of colleges conducted by the Order gradually rose to 900 in Europe and the missionary countries. The first duty of a member is strict but rational obedience. The professed fathers add to the three vows common to all religious orders a special vow of obedience to the Holy See by which they bind themselves to go unreservedly to any part of the world where the Pope may wish to send them. The Society of Jesus, the friars of the Dominican and Franciscan Orders, the Lazarist missionaries, in addition to their reformatory work at home, have founded flourishing missions with millions of converted heathens in India, China, Japan, western Asia, Africa, and North and South America, and thus in a measure compensated the loss which the Church sustained in Europe through the Protestant Revolution.

299. **The Council of Trent — Preparation.** — From the beginning of the so-called Reformation numerous demands were made for the meeting of a General Council. In Germany the question was mooted in almost every diet. But the Council which the Protestants desired was to be a free Council, in which clergy and laymen, Catholics and Protestants, should have a decisive vote. Even among Catholics of Gallican tendencies a Council was looked upon as a weapon against the Pope. Clement VII. personally treated with the Emperor about the summoning of a General Council, but he insisted on it, that it should be constituted in the canonical way like the earlier Ecumenical Councils, that all its members should be bound to submit to its decisions, and that all religious innovations must cease in the meantime. The Protestants rejected these terms. Paul III., after repeated interviews with Charles V., summoned the Council in 1536 to meet the following year in Mantua. Luther, who had delivered "all the Councils to the devil," and the Protestant princes assembled in Smalkald, raged with insensate fury against a Council presided over by the "Antichrist." Difficulties about the place of meeting, caused by local or national jealousies, and increased by the war between France and the Emperor, arose among the Catholics themselves. Time and again the Council had to be prorogued. The indefatigable zeal of Paul III. succeeded at last in assembling the Council at Trent, in the southern Tyrol.

300. Aim and External History of the Council of Trent. — The Council of Trent, 1545–1563, was convened for "the propagation of the faith, the elevation of the Christian religion, the uprooting of heresies, the restoration of peace, the reformation of the clergy and the Christian people, and the overthrow of the ene-

mies of the Christian name." At the outbreak of a pestilence in Trent, 1547, the majority voted a transfer to Bologna, whither the minority, however, did not follow. Deliberations were held in both cities. Charles V.'s quarrel with the Pope, after the battle of Mühlberg, induced Paul III. to interrupt the sessions. Julius III. (1550–1555) summoned it again to Trent in 1551. In this second period all the negotiations with the Protestants were frustrated by their proposing impossible conditions. They demanded a re-discussion of the articles already defined, the exclusion of the Pope or his representatives from the presidency, the recognition of the superiority of the Council over the Pope, and definitive votes and equal rights with the Catholic bishops for Protestant deputies. A second suspension became necessary, when Maurice of Saxony in his career of treachery occupied the defiles of the Tyrol. Ten years passed before the Council in 1562 was again assembled by Pius IV. (1559–65) at Trent, where it finished its labors the following year.

301. The Decrees of the Council. — The Council in its dogmatical chapters and canons, among other things, declared Holy Writ *and* tradition to be the norm of faith; vindicated the necessity of good works and the freedom of the human will against Luther's errors, and defined the doctrine of the seven sacraments, of Transubstantiation, and the Real Presence, of the Mass as a true sacrifice, of the sufficiency of holy Communion under one species, of purgatory, indulgences, and the veneration of Saints, relics and images.

The reformatory decrees enjoined the suppression of abuses, restricted the pluralities of holdings, regulated the duties of the clergy, especially the duty of episcopal residence, episcopal visitation of churches and clerical celibacy; made excellent provisions for the education of the clergy in diocesan seminaries, and ordained the holding of annual diocesan synods and triennial provincial councils.

302. Importance and Effects of the Council. — "The Council, that had been so vehemently demanded and so long evaded, that had been twice dissolved, had been shaken by so many political storms, closed amid the general harmony of the Catholic world." (Ranke.) Its immense importance is indicated by two effects. 1. It did away with all the fluctuations in doctrine, which the Protestant controversy had induced. While its efforts

failed to bring about a co-operation and reunion of the Protestants, its dogmatical decision furnished the unerring basis on which every future reunion was to be effected.

2. It created a system of reforms, which beginning at the court of Rome and working its way through all the grades of the hierarchy and priesthood to the whole Catholic people, became to the present day of the greatest importance. The faithful were again subjected to the discipline of the Church. Seminaries were founded, where young ecclesiastics were carefully brought up under strict discipline and in the fear of God. The parishes were regulated anew, the administration of the sacraments and preaching subjected to fixed ordinances. The bishops were strictly held to their duties, especially to the superintendence of the clergy. The bishops, from that to the present day, solemnly bound themselves by a special confession of faith, signed and sworn, to observe the decrees of the Council of Trent and to submit to the Pope, whose primacy of jurisdiction, as instituted by Christ, was recognized by the universal Church. Catholicism having thus concentrated its strength and braced up all its energies was now ready to meet the Protestant world.

303. Introduction of the Decrees. — The decrees of the Council of Trent, confirmed by a bull of Pius IV., were at once accepted in Venice, the principal states of Italy, Portugal and Poland. Philip II. published them in the Spanish countries (Spain, Naples and the Low Countries) adding the clause: without detriment to the regal prerogatives. Since 1564 they were accepted by the Catholic princes and ecclesiastical provinces of Germany for their territories, and in 1566 by Maximilian II. and the Diet of Augsburg for the Empire. In France the dogmatic decrees were accepted without qualification, but the court rejected the decrees on discipline, and only gradually did the bishops succeed in enforcing them.

304. The Popes After the Council. — The Popes who ruled after the Council of Trent, were all worthy pastors of the flock of Christ. Nepotism disappeared at the papal court. Rome again became the centre of piety and learning. The political activity of the Popes gave way to religious fervor and the protection of the spiritual interests of Christendom. Pius IV. was aided in his Pontificate by the apostolic piety and zeal of his nephew, Cardinal Charles Borromeo. Pius V., the last canonized Pope (1565–72), was as unweary in admonishing the clergy, high and low, to do their duty, as he was fearless in punishing transgressors. His government and

his life of prayer and mortification infused a new life and vigor into the whole Church, and earned him the veneration and obedience of the Catholic world, but also his rich share of Protestant hatred and calumny. Whilst Pius V. secured strength and stability to Catholicism, his successor Gregory XIII. (1572–1585) gave it a new splendor by founding and endowing the Roman, the German-Hungarian, the English, the Greek and the Maronite Colleges, by building new churches, by sending rich subsidies to Catholic countries to aid them in the work of education and reform, and by introducing the famous Gregorian Calendar. He lacked only one quality to make an ideal Pontiff, the fearless energy necessary to suppress the pest of brigands which had begun to infest the Papal States. This task was effectively accomplished by his energetic successor, Sixtus V. (1585–1590), equally prominent as spiritual and temporal ruler, as administrator and reformer. He quickly restored public order and security by hanging evil-doers without respect of person and nobility, and greatly improved the administration of the treasury which had been nearly exhausted by the benefactions of Gregory XIII. The jubilee of 1600 celebrated by an immense concourse of people under Clement VIII. marked the high level of Catholic reformation, which was maintained in the seventeenth century.

305. **The Gregorian Calendar.** — The Gregorian Calendar was a correction and improvement of the Julian Calendar arranged by Julius Caesar in 707–708 A. U. C. More accurate astronomical observations made it apparent, that every 130 years the Julian era fell back a full day of the solar year. In the Pontificate of Gregory XIII. the discrepancy had increased to ten days since the year 325 A. D. To correct this deviation Gregory XIII. in 1582 struck out ten days, and called the 5th day of October the 15th. Thus the 22d day of December, old time, became January 1st, 1583, and the beginning of the Gregorian era. To maintain the accuracy of chronology every fourth year was to be a leap year, but so as to omit three days in every four centuries. Thus the year 1600 A. D. was to be a leap year; 1700, 1800 and 1900 ordinary years. In making this ingenious revision Gregory was principally assisted by the celebrated Jesuit mathematician Clavius of Bamberg. The Gregorian Calendar was adopted at once by all the Catholic countries, whilst the Protestants rejected the papal correction till after 1700, England till 1752, and Russia held out till 1901.

306. **The Saints of the Reformation Period.** — The revival of Catholic life was powerfully promoted by the great number of Saints, whom God's

Providence raised in the darkest days of the Protestant Revolution. A mere enumeration of the most prominent men and women, who exercised a public and wide-spread influence, must here suffice to illustrate the statement: St. Pius V. O. P., 1504–1572; St. Ignatius, 1491–1556; St. Gerolamo Emiliano, a patrician of Venice, and founder of the Somaschi who take care of orphans, 1481–1537; Bl. Juan d'Avila, the apostle of Andalusia, 1500–1569; St. Juan de Dios of Portugal, founder of the Order of Charity, 1495–1560; St. Pedro de Alcantara, 1499–1562; St. Francis Xavier, apostle of India and Japan, 1506–1552; St. Francis Borgia, duke of Gandia, and third General of the Society of Jesus, 1510–1572; St. Philip Neri, founder of the Oratorians, 1513–1595; St. Charles Borromeo, founder of the Oblates of St. Ambrose, 1538–1584; St. Juan de la Cruz, 1542–1591; St. Francis Solanus, 1546–1610; St. Francis Caracciolo, 1563–1608; St. Camillus a Lellis, d. 1614; St. Francis de Sales, the great bishop of Geneva and apostle among the Calvinists, 1567–1622; St. Vincent de Paul, 1576–1660; Bl. Peter Canisius, the apostle of Germany, 1521–1597; the Ven. Cardinal Baronius, 1528–1607; the Ven. Cardinal Bellarmin, 1542–1621; St. Joseph of Calasanza, founder of the Piarists, who devoted their lives to elementary and college education; St. Theresa of Avila, the reformer of the Carmelites, 1515–1583; St. Angela de Merici, foundress of the Ursulines, 1529–1582; St. Jane Frances Fremiot de Chantal, foundress of the Visitation, 1572–1641; St. Rose of Lima, the American flower of holiness, 1586–1617, and many others.

307. **Catholic Princes.** — The Catholic upbuilding received further aid from the protection of Catholic princes, who rightly deemed it their first duty to safeguard the true religion as the greatest boon to their peoples. To this class belonged a number of Italian princes, the kings of Spain, especially Philip II.; Ferdinand II. and Ferdinand III., archdukes and emperors of the House of Austria, Albert and Maximilian of Bavaria and the spiritual electors and prince-bishops of Germany. Convinced of the truth of Catholicity and authorized by the natural and canon law, they had a right to apply the legal maxim of the Religious Peace of Augsburg: cujus regio illius religio, and to remove the disturbers of the religious peace from their territories. In this they did but what all the Protestant princes practiced, with this difference, however, that the latter involved themselves in a manifest contradiction. For whilst they posed as champions of individual liberty and private interpretation, they nevertheless forced their subjects to accept their own creeds. Hence the Catholic reaction was a thoroughly religious movement dictated by conscience and based on the dogmas of faith, whilst the Protestant Revolution was managed by rulers who sought their own selfish interests, power and plunder. No doubt, in the protection which Philip II. accorded to the Catholics in the religious wars of France, ambition counted for something whilst religious aspirations were not entirely absent in the Protestant camp. But the two movements were so far different, that one was *essentially* religious, the other *essentially* political. In this conflict all the

moral advantages were on the side of the Church. This fact goes far to explain the success of the Catholic Restoration.

Popes. — C. W. Robinson: *Pope Adrian VI.:* M. '77, 3, p. 350 — Dr. v. Hoefler: *Papst Hadrian VI.* — Comte de Falloux: *Life of St. Pius V. — Gregory XIII.:* Darras, v. 4, p. 229, and other *Church Histories.* — Hübner: *Sixtus V.* — A. J. Dumesnil: *Hist. de Sixte Quint.;* On *Sixtus V.:* M., vol. 11, p. 394; A. C. Q., v. 3, p. 498. — Ranke: *The History of the Popes in the 16th and 17th Centuries.* — M. Creighton, vol. 5. — On *The Gregorian Calendar:* H. P. B., vol. 3, pp. 388, 543; vol. 5, p. 52. — S. H. Nicolas: *Chronology of History.* — W. Hales: *New Analysis of Chronology*, vol. 1, bk. 1.

Council of Trent, etc — Pallavicini: *History of the Council of Trent* (Lat). — Joh. Janssen: *On Council of Trent and Catholic Reform*, vols. 2-5. — Rev. J. Waterworth: *The Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent* (transl.) *with Essays on the external and internal History of the Council.* — Hefele-Hergenroether, C. G.: *The Council of Trent* (vol. 10). — Bauer: *Das Concil von Trient:* St., v. 3, p. 404. — Prat: *Histoire del Concile de Trente.* — Ch. Dejob: *De l'influence du Concile de Trente sur la litterature et les beaux-arts.* — Dittrich, H. P. B., vol. 5, p. 319 (*On the Catholic Reformation*). — J. M. Stone: *Aspects of the Renaissance: The Catholic Revival.* — Marshall: *Christian Missions.*

Modern Saints. — G. P. Guissano: *The Life of St. Charles Borromeo, Cardinal Archb. of Milan*, prefaced by Card. Manning; *St. Charles Borromeo and his Biographers:* A. C. Q., v. 10, p. 326. — *Lives of St. Francis of Sales, Bishop and Prince of Geneva*, by: A. de Margerie-Maitland; Robert Ornsby, M. A.; H. B. Mackey, O. S. B. (C. T. S. P., v. 6). — Claude Maimbourg: *The Life of St. Thomas of Villanova, Archb. of Valentia.* — Capecelatro-Pope: *Life of St. Philip Neri;* also by G. A. Lee, C. T. S. P.; Hilgers, S. J., St., vol. 4, pp. 16, 349, 485. — *Lives of St. Vincent de Paul* by Bougaud-Brady; Prince Emmanuel de Broglie-Partridge; F. Goldie, C. T. S. P., vol. 13. — V. Lewis, M. A., *Life of St. John of the Cross.* — E. Bougaud: *Hist. of St. Joan Frances de Chantal.* — *Lives of St. Theresa* written by herself, transl. by Rev. J. Dalton; D. Lewis, M. A.: C. T. S. P., v. 19. — F. W. Faber: *The Life of St. Rose of Lima — Catholic Biographies*, C. T. S. P., vol. 1-4. — Butler's *Lives of the Saints.* — *The Bollandists' Lives.* — *Lives of St. Ignatius Loyola* by W. van Nieuwenhoff, S. J. (the latest and best); Bartoli; Genelli-Meyrick; Anderdon, C. T. S. P., v. 4; Joly (*the Saints*); Stewart Rose (*and the Early Jesuits*): Wieser (*Luther and Ignatius*), J. K. Z. '84, pp. 71, 344; Th. Hughes: *Loyola and the Educational System of the Jesuits.* — *Lives of St. Francis Xavier*: Coleridge, Bartoli-Maffei, ed. by Dr. Faber; F. Goldie, C. T. S. P., v. 13. — Cretineau-Joly: *Histoire de la Comp. de Jesu.* — Maynard: *The Studies and Teaching of the Society of Jesus.* — J. A. Corcoran: *The Jesuits:* A. C. Q., v. 1, p. 51. — Duhr: *Jesuitenfabeln* (critical investigation of charges).

Other General Works on the Period. — Challoner: *Short History of the Protestant Religion.* — Canon Flanegan: *A History of the Church in England.* — Dixon: *History of the Church of England.* — Dodd-Tierny: *Church History of England.* — James Walsh: *History of the Catholic Churchin Scotland.* — Wilkins: *Concilia.* — W. Mazières-Brady: *The Episcopal Succession in England, Scotland and Ireland, 1400-1873.* — J. Gillow: *Bibliographical Dictionary of Eng. Catholics.* — T. F. Knox: *Records of Eng. Catholics and the Penal Laws.* — T. E. Bridgett: *Blunders and Forgeries; Historical Essays.* — Moberly: *The Early Tudors.* — Busch: *England under the Tudors.* — M. Creighton: *The Tudors and the Reformation.* — J. H. Burton: *The History of Scotland.* — *Acts of Parliaments of Scotland, 1560-1711.*

THE PROMINENT POPES OF THE PERIOD.

Alexander VI., 1492–1503.
JULIUS II., 1503–1513.
Leo X., 1513–1522.
Adrian VI., 1522–1523.

Clement VII., 1523–1534.
Paul III., 1534–1549.
Julius III., 1550–1555.
Paul IV., 1555–1559.

Pius IV., 1559–1565.
ST. PIUS V., 1566–1572.
GREGORY XIII., 1572–1585.
SIXTUS V., 1585–1590.
Clement VIII., 1592–1605.

THE EMPERORS.

MAXIMILIAN I. (Emperor-elect), 1493–1519. **CHARLES V.** (last Emperor crowned), 1519–1556. Ferdinand I., 1556–1564.

KINGS OF FRANCE.

Charles VIII. (House of Valois), 1483–1498.
Louis XII. (House of Orleans), 1498–1515.
Francis I. (House of Orleans-Angoulême), 1515–1547.
Henry II. (m. Catharine de' Medici), 1547–1559.

KINGS OF SPAIN.

Isabella of Castile, 1474–1504.
Ferdinand of Aragon, 1479–1516.
Charles I. (Emp. Ch. V.), 1516–1555.
Philip II., 1555–1598.

THE TUDORS IN ENGLAND.

Henry VII., 1485–1509.
Henry VIII., 1509–1547.
Edward VI., 1547–1553.
Mary the Catholic, 1553–1558.
Elisabeth, 1558–1603.

THE ITALIAN WARS, 1494–1559.

1. INVASION OF ITALY BY CHARLES VIII., 1494–1495.

Causes.	*Leagues.*	*Battles and Military Actions.*	*Results and Treaties of Peace.*
The renewal of the claims to Naples by *Charles VIII.* as heir of the House of *Anjou.*		Conquest of *Naples* by *Charles VIII.*, 1494.	
	Alliance of *Venice, Maximilian I., Ferdinand of Aragon, Ludovico Sforza* of Milan against *Charles VIII.*	Charles VIII. expelled from Naples and Italy, 1495 (*Gonsalvo of Cordova*, "The Great Captain."	Naples restored to *Ferdinand II.*

2. THE CONQUEST OF MILAN BY LOUIS XII., 1499–1500.

Louis XII. as grandson of *Valentina Visconti* laid claims to *Milan.*	*Louis XII.* allied with *Alexander VI., Venice* and *Florence* against Ludovico Sforza.	Conquest of the *Milanese* by *Louis XII.* 1499. — *Sforza*, after reconquering Milan, became Louis' prisoner at *Novara*, 1500.	*Louis XII.* retained the *duchy of Milan; Venice* obtained *Cremona* and a slice of the *Milanese*, *Caesar Borgia* the government of the Romagna.

3. THE RECONQUEST OF NAPLES, 1501-1504.

A treaty between *Louis XII.* and *Ferdinand of Aragon*, for the conquest and partition of *Naples*.	Alliance between *Louis XII.*, *Ferdinand of Aragon* and *Alexander VI.*, 1501.	1. Conquest of *Naples* by the allies from *Frederic*, the last Aragonese king of Naples, 1501. 2. The "*Great Captain*" drives his French allies from the country, 1504.	The whole kingdom secured to *Ferdinand*. *Louis XII.* gives up his Neapolitan claims.

4. WAR OF THE LEAGUE OF CAMBRAY AGAINST VENICE, 1508-1509.

(a). *Ferdinand* desired to release a number of Neapolitan ports pledged to *Venice*. (b). *Louis XII.*, to round off his Milanese possessions. (c). *Maximilian* had been refused passage through *Venice* on his coronation trip. (d). *Venice* had violated the territorial and spiritual rights of the Church.	The **LEAGUE OF CAMBRAY**: *Louis XII.*, *Ferdinand of Aragon*, *Maximilian I.* (1508), *Julius II.* (1509) against *Venice*.	The French victory of **AGRADELLO** crushed the military power of Venice, 1509.	*Maximilian* gained no advantage; *Ferdinand* obtained his ports, *Louis XII.* additional territory, *Julius II.* the *Romagna*. The Pope reconciled himself with Venice and withdrew from the *League of Cambray*.

5. THE WARS OF THE HOLY LEAGUE, 1511-1515.

The *first* object of this League in *Italy* was the "preservation of the unity of the Church, the integrity of her patrimony," and the expulsion of the French from Italian soil. Against the schismatical synod of *Pisa* Julius II. summoned the **XVIII. GENERAL COUNCIL (V. IN THE LATERAN)**, 1512.	**THE HOLY LEAGUE: JULIUS II.** allied with the *Swiss Confederacy*, *Ferdinand of Spain* and *Venice* (1511), *Henry VIII.* of England (1511), and *Maximilian I.* (1512), against *France*. Venice went over to France in 1513.	The French stormed *Brescia* (**BAYARD**), defeated the allies at *Ravenna*, but lost *Milan* and nearly all Italy through the bravery of the *Swiss*, 1512.	A Congress of the Allies at *Mantua* restored *Milan* to *Maximilian Sforza*, Ludovico's eldest son, Florence to the *Medici* (*Lorenzo II.*), the territory lost in the last war to *Venice*, and gave *Bellinzona* to the *Swiss Confederation*, and *Parma* and *Piacenza* to the *Holy See*.
The *second* object of the allies was a *partition of France* be-	*France* and *Venice* against the League.	*Louis XII.* again invading Italy routed by the Swiss at **NO-**	

THE ITALIAN WARS — *Continued.*

tween the members of the League.		**VARA**, 1513. The French routed by *Maximilian* and the English at *Guinegate* (Battle of the Spurs), 1513. *James IV.* of Scotland, invading *England* in the interest of *France*, lost battle, army and life at **FLODDEN FIELD**, 1513.	
The war was renewed by *Francis I.* desiring to wipe out the disgrace which *Louis XII.* had brought on his country.	*Francis I.* and *Venice* against *Leo X.*, *Maximilian*, *Ferdinand*, the *Duke of Milan*, the *Medici of Florence* and the *Swiss.*	Victory of Francis I. at **MARIGNANO** over the Swiss, who fought with the utmost bravery, 1515.	*Results of the B. of Marignano: Milan* surrendered to *France*. *Maximilian Sforza* became a French pensioner. Peace between *Francis I.* and *Switzerland*, and between *Francis* and *Leo X.*, who sacrificed *Parma* and *Piacenza*. *Peace of Noyon* between *Charles I.* of Spain and *Francis I.* (1516). The members of the League restored *Venice* to her former power, but her military prestige was lost.

6. FIRST WAR BETWEEN CHARLES V. AND FRANCIS I., 1522–1523.

1. The union of the *Spanish* and *Hapsburg lands* in the hands of *Charles V.* 2. The defeat of *Francis I.* in his competition for the imperial crown. 3. *Francis'* claims to *Navarre* and *Naples*, and *Charles'* claims to *Burgundy* and *Milan.*	*Charles V.* allied with *Leo X.*, *Adrian VI.*, *Venice*, *Milan*, *Florence* and *Genoa*, later the *Constable of Bourbon* and *Henry VIII.* (scheme of a partition of France).	Seat of war in *Navarre*, the *Low Countries*, *Southern France*, *Picardy* and **ITALY**. Two French invasions of *Italy*. Conquered Milan was given to *Francis Sforza*. Decisive battle: **PAVIA**, 1525. Rout and captivity of *Francis I.*	**PEACE OF MADRID**, 1526. *Francis* gave up his claims to *Naples*, *Milan*, *Burgundy*, *Flanders*, and *Artois*. He left his two sons as hostages in the hands of *Charles*, but repudiated the treaty after his liberation.

7. SECOND WAR BETWEEN CHARLES V. AND FRANCIS I., 1527–1529.

1. The repudiation of the *Treaty of Madrid.* 2. The *Alliance of Cognac.*	Alliance concluded at *Cognac*: *Clement VII.*, *Francis I.*, *Milan*, and later *Henry VIII.* against	**STORMING** and terrible **SACKING OF ROME** by the Imperialists under *Charles*	**TREATY OF BARCELONA**, 1529, Charles restored to Clement VII. all his rights.

3. General fear of the growing power of *Spain*.	*Charles V.* *Genoa*, first for the *League*, later for *Charles V.*	*of Bourbon*, who fell. The French driven from *Naples* and *Genoa* (*Andrea Doria*), the *Medici* from *Florence*.	**TREATY OF CAMBRAY**, 1529 (*Ladies' Peace*,) negotiated by *Louisa of Savoy*, the mother of *Francis I.*, and *Margaret of Austria*, *Charles'* aunt. *Francis* paid two million crowns for the release of his sons and renounced his claims to *Italy*, *Flanders* and *Artois*. *Charles* waived his claims to *Burgundy* and released the princes.

8. **THIRD WAR BETWEEN CHARLES V. AND FRANCIS I.**, 1536–1538.

After the death of *Francis Sforza* without issue *Francis I.* once more claimed *Milan*.	*Francis I.*, allied with *Suleyman the Magnificent*, who harassed Hungary and the Mediterranean.	Invasion of *Provence* by *Charles V.* and of *Savoy and Piedmont by Francis I.*	*Truce of Nice*, 1538, for ten years, preliminary to a definite peace.

9. **FOURTH WAR BETWEEN CHARLES V. AND FRANCIS I.**, 1543–1544.

1. The failure of the negotiations for a definite peace. 2. The investiture of *Philip*, the son of *Charles V.* with *Milan*.	Francis was allied with the *Turks* and the *Duke of Cleves*, *Charles* with *Henry VIII.*	The *Franco-Turkish* fleet plundered *Nice*. *Charles V.* defeated the *Duke of Cleves* and marched to *Soissons*, whilst *Henry VIII.* took *Boulogne*.	The **PEACE OF CRESPY**, 1544, concluded by Francis to save Paris. Francis renounced his claims to *Milan* and *Naples*, *Flanders* and *Artois*, *Charles V.* his claims to *Burgundy*.

10. **WAR BETWEEN CHARLES V. AND HENRY II. OF FRANCE**, 1552–1556.

The war was caused by the occupation by **HENY II.** of **METZ**, **TOUL** and **VERDUN**, surrendered to him through the treason of *Maurice of Saxony*. The expedition, including the siege of *Metz*, failed. A truce left France provisionally in possession of the territory occupied.

11. **WAR BETWEEN PHILIP II. AND HENRY II.**, 1556–1559.

The policy of *Paul IV.* to drive *Spain* from *Naples* in union with *France*.	*Paul IV.* and *Henry II.* against *Philip II.* of Spain and *Mary the Catholic* of England.	The *Duke of Alva* finally secured *Naples* to *Spain*. The French defeated by the Spaniards and English at *St. Quentin*, 1557, and by *Count Egmont* at *Gravelines*, 1558. **CALAIS** captured by *Francis, Duke of Guise*.	**PEACE OF CATEAU CAMBRESIS**, 1559. The French restored all their conquests except **CALAIS** and the three bishoprics *Metz*, *Toul* and *Verdun*.

BOOK III.

THE WARS OF THE PROTESTANT REVOLUTION.

CHAPTER I.

THE HUGUENOT WARS IN FRANCE.

§ 1.

FORMATION OF PARTIES.

308. Protestantism in France. — From an early date Protestantism obtained numerous adherents in France in every class of society, even at court. Especially the southern provinces, the old homes of the Albigenses and Waldenses, were strongly infected with heresy. Francis I. had, to some extent, prepared France for the new doctrines by his arbitrary dealings with the Church, and his unworthy appointment of bishops under a privilege obtained from Leo X. Breaches of the public peace and attacks on churches, images and priests roused the king's fear that the religious revolt might lead to a civil revolt. Thus Francis I., who encouraged Protestanism in Germany, and allied himself with the Turks, became a persecutor of the Protestants at home. Fugitive Protestants found a refuge and protection at the court of the king's sister, Margaret of Valois, who had married Henry d'Albret, king of Navarre. Her usual residence at Nérac became the centre of Protestants and Freethinkers.

The Voudois or Waldenses of Provence, 1530, joined the Swiss Protestants. Expelled from the papal territory in the south of France they took

revenge by sacrilegious attacks on churches, sacred images and priests. The Parliament of Aix ordered the destruction of one of their villages and the execution of 19 persons. The king, however, granted them time for reconciliation, and the decree of Aix was kept in abeyance for five years. The Voudois employed this time in arming themselves, and, occasionally, plundering and desecrating churches. Upon repeated complaints Francis I. in 1544 placed troops at the disposal of Oppede, president of the Parliament of Aix, who in 1545 raged with barbarian severity against the Waldenses. This inhuman persecution, in which 22 villages are said to have been destroyed, and hundreds of persons slain or executed, is called the Massacre of the Voudois.

309. Under Henry II. — Henry II. continued the policy of his father. The Edict of Chateaubriand, 1551, ordered a vigorous persecution of the Calvinists, who had meanwhile become the most prominent sect in France. An edict of 1555 handed over ecclesiastical trials to the harsher treatment of the secular courts. As the Parliament of Paris refused to register a new royal ordinance which restored to the bishops the conduct of ecclesiastical trials, Paul IV. at the instance of Cardinal Lorraine tried to introduce the Inquisition in France, but without success. In spite of all measures of oppression Calvinism spread. Smaller groups, who had worshipped privately, began to form public congregations, first in Paris (1555), subsequently in other cities. A portion of the highest nobility, especially the houses of Bourbon and Chatillon, joined the Calvinists for political reasons. At a general synod held in Paris, 1559, the different Protestant bodies formed a union, adopted a Calvinist profession of faith, and a Presbyterian form of church government, and passed a decree, that all heretics, Catholics of course included, should be put to death. Thus the train was laid for the sanguinary civil and religious wars, which devastated France for the next thirty years.

310. The House of Orleans-Angoulême.

FRANCIS I., 1515–1547 (Angoulême).

Henry II., 1547–1559 (Orleans-Angoulême) m. Catharine de' Medici.

FRANCIS II., 1559–60. m. Mary Queen of Scots.	**CHARLES IX.**, 1560–1574.	**HENRY III.**, 1574–1589.	*Francis*, D. of Alençon and Anjou.	*Elizabeth*, m. Philip II. of Spain.	*Margaret of Valois*, m. **HENRY IV.**, **BOURBON.**

311. The House of Bourbon.


LOUIS IX., the Saint, d. 1270.
Robert, Duke of Clermont, m. Beatrice of Bourbon.
Sixth descendant, Francis.
Charles, Duke of Vendôme.
Anthony, m. Jeanne d'Albret, Queen of Navarre.
Charles, Cardinal Bourbon, Archb. of Rouen, (Charles X.)
Louis, Prince of Condé.
HENRY IV.
Henry, Prince of Condé.
Henry II. of Bourbon.

312. The House of Guise.


Louis IX., the Saint.
Robert, Duke of Clermont-Bourbon.
Francis, sixth descendant.
Antoinette, m. Claude, Duke of Guise.
Francis Duke of Guise, murdered 1563.
Charles, Cardinal of Lorraine. Archb. of Rheims.
Claude, Duke of Aumale.
Louis, Cardinal Guise.
Mary of Guise, m. James V. of Scotland.
Henry, Duke of Guise. murdered 1588.
Louis, Cardinal Guise, murdered 1588.
Charles, Duke of Mayenne.
Mary, Queen of Scots.

313. The Guises. — Francis II. (1559–60), the eldest and best of the four sons of Henry II., though weak in body and mind, succeeded his father in 1559. The exercise of power in his short reign was an object of contention between Catharine de' Medici, the Bourbon princes and the powerful House of Guise.

Catherine de' Medici, the mother of three successive kings, was a politician and cared little about religion itself. She followed the maxim of Macchiavelli's "Prince," which the author had dedicated to her father, Lorenzo II. de' Medici: "For the maintenance of power every means is allowed." She sided with the Catholics or with the rebels, allied herself with Calvinists, Lutherans or Turks, just as her interests seemed to require it. The Guises were uncompromising Catholics and had distinguished themselves in the recent

wars with Charles V. Duke Francis of Guise had taken Calais from the English. The Cardinal was a man of commanding presence and temper, unblemished character and great zeal in discharging the duties of his Archbishopric. The French kings, who had strengthened the Protestants in Germany for political reasons, had now to fight with a powerful faction of Protestants at home who strove to overthrow the royal power. The Guises became under Francis II. the soul of the government. Their position was strengthened by the fact that their niece, Mary Stuart, queen of Scots, was also queen of France.

314. The Huguenots. — All who were disaffected towards the court, joined the Bourbons who felt themselves slighted by the influence of the Guises as descendants of the foreign House of Lorraine. The members of the disaffected party came to be called Huguenots, a name which has some obscure relation to Hugh Capet. The Huguenots were divided into Huguenots of Religion, i. e., Calvinists, like Anthony, king of Navarre, prince Louis Condé, admiral Gaspard Coligny, of the House of Châtillon, and his brothers, Daudelot and Odet; and Huguenots of Politics, such as constable Anne de Montmorency, uncle of the Colignys, and other dissatisfied Catholics, who were jealous of the Guises. Between the Huguenots and the Catholics stood a party of compromisers, led by Michel L'Hôpital, keeper of the seal, employed by the queen-mother for her ambitious aims. The Calvinists, between 1555 and 1562, organized 2,150 communities; they became strong through the boldness of their leaders, their political alliances with Elisabeth of England and the Protestant princes of Germany, the secret favor of L'Hôpital, and the changeful policy of Catharine.

315. The Conspiracy of Amboise, 1560. — The conspiracy of Amboise was the first attempt to play the government of France into the hands of the Huguenots. It was the result of a meeting of the leading Calvinists at La Ferté, a castle of prince Condé, to organize an insurrection in favor of Calvinism. Calvin had approved of the plan if the revolt were headed by a prince of the blood. The chief conspirators covered their traces. The execution of the plan, intrusted to John de Barri, and to be carried out at Amboise, com-

prised the seizing of the king's person, the murder of the Guises and the election of Condé to the regency.

The plot was discovered by the duke of Guise, frustrated by the defeat of several armed bands, and the fall of John de Barri, and punished by the execution of the ringleaders. Prince Condé was, this time, left undisturbed, though Calvinist insurrections continued to break out in different parts of France. But being soon after convicted of a new conspiracy, he was arrested and sentenced to death. Before the sentence was carried out, the king died, and Catharine de' Medici, now acting as regent, made her peace with the Bourbons, 1560.

316. Party Changes — Conference of Poissy. — The accession of Charles IX. at the age of ten was followed by a violent political agitation. Before the death of Francis II. the States General had been summoned, the first time for the last seventy-seven years. The elections, the debates, the revolutionary demands of the Huguenots and their favorers, served the Calvinist propaganda to increase their number and influence. For although they represented only one-thirtieth part of France, they commanded a majority in the Assembly. At court Anthony of Navarre, Condé, the Colignys, were received as favorites, the Guises slighted, and the Catholics insulted in the very streets of Paris. Tumults between Catholics and Calvinists who went armed to their meetings, broke out in different places. This change convinced Montmorency, that only union with the Guises could save the Catholic cause. On Easter Sunday, 1561, three men, Francis of Guise, Montmorency, and Marshal St. André, knelt at the same altar, and after Holy Communion swore to devote their lives to the defense of the Catholic religion. The Huguenots derisively called this league the Triumvirate. After the Conference of Poissy, which contributed to the conversion of Anthony of Navarre, he too joined the Triumvirate. All four sealed their promises with their blood.

To please the Huguenots Catharine and L'Hôpital had summoned a religious conference to Poissy. The chief among the many speakers were, on the Catholic side Cardinal Lorraine and Jacob Lainez, the second general of the Society of Jesus; on the Calvinist side Theodore Beza, the most prominent disciple of Calvin and the Italian apostate Peter Martyr. Beza's in-

ability to prove a divine mission, and his assertion that the body of Christ was as far from the appearances of bread and wine as heaven from earth made any understanding between the parties impossible.

317. Edict of Toleration and Massacre of Vassy, 1562. — The general result of the Conference was disastrous to France. Simultaneously all over the country the false rumor was started among the Calvinists that their party had won the victory at Poissy, and that the government had granted liberty of worship. The Huguenots were well armed. Under the see-saw policy of the compromise government they had levied men and contributions, organized military bodies some of them commanded by preacher captains, and placed a large army at the disposal of Condé and Coligny. Under the war cry of "free meetings and free preaching" they rose in Montpelier, Carcassonne, Cahors, Amiens, Toulouse, Marseilles, Tours, Dijon, Paris, and many other places. With incredible fury they plundered and sacked churches and monasteries, destroyed altars and images, threw the Blessed Sacrament before their horses, murdered landlords and priests, drove Catholic peasants with cowhides to their sermons, devastated the fields and vineyards around towns and villages that refused to accept their gospel, and terrorized the local courts. All this happened four months before the so-called massacre of Vassy, at a time when the government was more favorable to them than to the Catholics. In the midst of this terrorism Catharine and L'Hôpital summoned an assembly of nobles to St. Germain, who in the old spirit of double-dealing imbecility drew up the unfortunate Edict of Toleration of January 17, 1562. It ordered the Huguenots to restore the churches and other property taken from the Catholics, prohibited further acts of violence, but gave state recognition to the Calvinists by allowing them to meet in the suburbs of cities and in the country. Noblemen were allowed to go armed to these assemblies, but not the people. Neither Catholics nor Protestants were satisfied with this fabrication. The Parliament of Paris for a long time refused to assent, and finally registered the edict under protest.

318. Massacre of Vassy, 1562. — Under these circumstances Anthony of Navarre, then lieutenant-general of the realm called Francis of Guise, Montmorency and Marshal St. André to Paris in

the interest of the Catholic cause. On the way to the capital the retinue of Guise came into conflict with a meeting of Calvinists, 600–700 strong, mostly armed, assembled in a barn at Vassy. The duke, whilst trying to quell the disturbance, was wounded. Thereupon the duke's followers became unmanageable and twelve Calvinists were slain on the spot, and forty more died afterwards of their wounds. The event was neither intended nor foreseen by the duke who was merely passing through Vassy, and was hearing Mass when the trouble began. The fact that his sick wife, carried in a litter, and his little children accompanied him, excluded all premeditation of an attack. It is absurd to speak of the massacre of Vassy as a signal to fall upon the Huguenots. But the Calvinists cried treason and Beza preached a general crusade against the Catholics. Guise, arriving with Montmorency and Marshal St. André in Paris, was received by the citizens with indescribable enthusiasm. The merchants offered him 2,000,000 livres for the defense of the faith and the pacification of the city. Refusing the gift, the duke replied that he simply placed himself at the king's disposal. Condé, failing in a new attempt to get the court into his power, gathered a few thousands of his adherents and by surprise captured the city of Orleans. This was the beginning of eight cruel and sanguinary wars, in which religious, political and personal motives were mixed up in inextricable confusion.

Kervyn de Lettenhove: *Les Huguenots of les Gueux.*—W. Loughnan: *The Huguenots*, C. T. S. P., v. 20; M. '92, 3, pp. 70, 234.—G. Masson: *The Huguenots.—Catharine de Medici;* M. '76, pp. 344, 478.—Le comte Delaborde: *Gaspard de Coligny, amiral de France.*—Duke d'Aumale: *The Princes of Condé.*—G. Pigot: *Histoire des Etats Generaux.*—Arthur Tilley: *To Religious Wars in France* (Contemporary Pamphlets): E. H. R., v. 14, p. 451.—J. A. Corcoran: On Beza, A. C. Q., v. 4, p. 521; vol. 5, p. 715.—R. Bauer, S. J.: *Die Huguenotten Kriege ein Werk der Toleranz*, St., vol. 11, pp. 143, 271, 414, 494.—Dr. Bellesheim: *Das erste Jahrhundert des Protestantismus in Frankreich*: H. P. B., '85, pp. 296, 352.

§ 2.

THE FIRST THREE WARS AND THE MASSACRE OF ST. BARTHOLOMEW'S.

319. The First War, 1562–63.—The first three wars were rather different stages of one war in which the Huguenots were defeated in the field, but acquired an increase of liberty and power in the treaties of peace, on account of the exhaustion of the victors and the duplicity of Catharine's policy.

Coligny and Condé applied to Elisabeth of England for help, and obtained it in exchange for the city of Havre, which Coligny surrendered to the English as a pledge not only for the money to be advanced but also for the restoration of Calais. With the aid obtained the Huguenot party seized over 200 towns. Their two strongholds were Orleans and Rouen. The Catholic army, once roused to action, reconquered most of them, took Rouen and expelled the English garrison. Here Anthony of Navarre received his mortal wound. The duke of Guise reinforced by Spanish troops, won the battle of Dreux, where Condé was defeated and made prisoner, while on the Catholic side Montmorency fell into Huguenot captivity and Marshal St. André was treacherously murdered by a former servant, now a Huguenot captain. The Catholics suffered their greatest loss in the siege of Orleans through the death of Francis of Guise, who was murdered with a poisoned ball by Poltrôt, a fanatical hireling of Coligny. The duke died forgiving his murderer. With him the Catholics lost a gallant leader and wise statesman. His removal from the scene of action and the general desire to expel the English led to the Peace of Amboise, in which valuable concessions were made to the Calvinists. Condé and his followers were declared loyal subjects, and freedom of worship was granted to the Huguenots in all the cities which they held, and in one town of each bailliwick. Havre was then reconquered from the English by the united efforts of the liberated Montmorency and the pardoned Condé. With the fall of Havre, Calais was forever lost to England by Elisabeth's own treacherous policy.

In the first year alone of the Huguenot war, the Calvinists, according to their own statements* murdered 4,000 religious, expelled or maltreated 12,000 nuns, sacked 20,000 churches, destroyed 2,000 monasteries with their monuments of art and book treasures. Among the libraries destroyed the most important was that of venerable Cluny whose rare manuscript collections could never be replaced. The vandals demolished the tomb of William the Conqueror, overthrew the statue of Jeanne d'Arc on the bridge of Orleans, and cast the relics of St. Irenaeus and St. Martin of Tours into the Loire. Granting that the above figures are exaggerated, they sufficiently indicate the character of the Huguenot wars. It was but human nature, that the Catholics too, — the bulk of the French people as against a handful of rebels relying on foreign help — goaded into despair by the trimming government and exasperated beyond measure by the constant desecration of their Holiest Mystery, retaliated upon the Calvinists, especially upon their fanatical preachers.

320. Second War, 1567–68. — The government employed the three years of a quiet truce which followed the first war, in legal and administrative reforms, the simplification of trials, and the establishment of commercial courts, thus gradually putting in shape the judicial code prevailing in France

* Aubert le Mire: *Nouvelle Collection de memoires relatif à l'histoire de France, ch. XI., p. 512.*

down to the Social Revolution. It was foreign news, the victory of the Scotch Calvinists over Mary Stuart (see no. 387) and the reverses of the Calvinists in the revolted Spanish Netherlands, which stirred up the Huguenots to fresh activity. Unable to win over the king and the queen-mother to an openly Calvinistic policy, Condé and Coligny attempted a repetition of the conspiracy of Amboise, and failing to seize Charles IX. and Catharine de' Medici, laid siege to the capital. Mortmorency defeated them at St. Denis, but fell in the battle, 1567. Reinforced by German Calvinists under John Casimir, son of palsgrave Frederic III., Condé forced the Catholics to raise the siege of Orleans. This partial success prompted the Peace of Longjumeau which renewed the Peace Edict of Amboise, but demanded the dismissal of the German auxiliaries and the restoration of the places garrisoned by the Huguenots. When the latter violated the terms of the peace by keeping their strongholds, seizing new towns from the Catholics and treating their inhabitants with revolting cruelty, Charles IX. revoked the former concessions made to the Huguenots and gave orders to proceed with severity against the rebels. The trimmer L'Hôpital was now dismissed.

321. **Third War, 1569–70.** — An attempt to bring Condé and Coligny to justice drove them to the sea-town of La Rochelle, henceforth the headquarters of the Huguenots, where Henry of Navarre joined them. At Jarnac the Huguenots were defeated by the king's brother Henry, duke of Anjou, and the elder Condé fell. They suffered a second defeat by the royal army at Montcontour. The exhaustion of the royal treasury and jealousy of the victors on the part of the court, led to the Peace of St. Germain-en-Laye, 1570, which gave to the Huguenots freedom of worship in all France, Paris alone excepted, and four strong places of security to be garrisoned by themselves. It was a peace more favorable to the Huguenots than any previous treaty.

322. **Huguenot Ascendency at the Court.** — The treaty of St. Germain-en-Laye robbed the Catholics of the advantages which they had won on the fields of Jarnac and Montcontour. Instead of strengthening the peace by supporting the legitimate rights of the Church, Catharine had recourse to a new compromise, that of marrying the young leader of the Huguenots, Henry of Navarre, to her Catholic daughter, Margaret of Valois. Meanwhile Coligny was received into the favor of Charles IX. Under his influence the king espoused the Protestant side in European politics, promoted the marriage of Henry of Navarre with his sister, sought the alliance of Elisabeth of England, extended support to the Calvinist rebels in the Low Countries and sent Genlis at the head of a Huguenot army against the Spaniards in the Netherlands. Genlis was defeated at Mons in June, 1572. Coligny succeeded in sowing discord between

the king and his mother who was strongly opposed to a war with Spain, but saw herself deprived of all influence over Charles IX. When Coligny urged the king openly to declare war, Catharine hastened to Montpipeau where Charles was then staying, and remonstrated with him in a great passion, but without lasting result (Aug. 10). From that day Catharine was resolved to get rid of Coligny, in order to regain her influence over the king.

323. **The Marriage of Religions.** — The "marriage of religions," as the union of Henry and Margaret was called, took place with great pomp on August 18. It was celebrated without the necessary papal dispensation, which both Pius V. and Gregory XIII. had refused to the last. It was celebrated against the will of the bride, who had to be rudely forced by her royal brother at the very altar to give an outward sign of a consent which did not exist. The marriage proved most unhappy to her on account of the dissolute life of her husband. It was declared null in 1599. To Catherine it offered the opportunity to carry out her attempt upon Coligny's life, which she had meanwhile matured with her favorite son Henry of Anjou. They hoped to be able to throw the blame on the Guises or some agent of Spain.

324. The Massacre of St. Bartholomew's. — On the morning of August 22 Coligny was fired upon by a hired assassin, and wounded in the wrist. It was natural that the criminal attack upon their leader created intense excitement among the Huguenots. They had no doubt as to the author of the deed, and dire were their threats of reprisals: "Coligny's arm was to cost 40,000 other arms." Catharine in the utmost alarm confessed to Charles that she and Anjou were the authors of the attempt; and that only a sudden blow could save them from the vengeance of the Huguenots, and after a resistance of an hour and a half on the king's part, finally induced him to consent to the murder of the leading Huguenots. In a council of state, held August 23, the following day, the feast of St. Bartholomew, was fixed for the execution of the crime. It began on the early morning of August 24. Coligny was the first to perish at the hands of a party headed by the young duke of Guise. Between 1,000 and 2,000 fell in Paris, and in the course of time about the same number in the provinces. Many who were not Huguenots perished. The leaders had wished to murder only the influential men of the party. But the population of Paris could not be re-

strained. Debtors sought out their creditors, enemies paid off old grudges, all law and order was at an end. Both in Paris and in the provinces many Huguenots were saved by the humanity of officials and the charity of priests and religious. The Archbishop of Lyons, and the bishops of Lisieux, Bordeaux, Toulouse and other dioceses sheltered the fleeing Huguenots and restrained the popular violence.

325. The Massacre not Preconcerted. — The massacre of St. Bartholomew's was not the result of a plan conceived long before its execution or premeditated in the Peace of St. Germain-en-Laye. All the reports written by persons who were in Paris during those days, agree in stating, that the queen-mother conceived the plan after the attempt upon Coligny's life, August 22, and that she prevailed with much difficulty upon Charles IX. to give his consent. Such are the narratives of Margaret of Valois, of Tavannes, the papal, the Spanish, the Venetian and the Florentine ambassadors. If the theory of premeditation is accepted it is impossible to explain why the execution was so long delayed. The Huguenot guests had arrived five weeks before, and every day increased the danger of a revelation. How could the plot have been kept secret so long, whilst the leaders, Henry of Navarre, Condé, Coligny and others lived and moved in the immediate surrounding of the king, and Catharine had many Huguenot ladies in her personal train? Had the plan been prearranged, orders would have been sent to the provinces securing its simultaneous execution, whilst these orders arrived at different times between August 25 and October 3. Nothing would have been more senseless than the separate attack on Coligny, because it was bound to arouse the suspicion of the Huguenots and to endanger the whole plot. Besides, no doubt is possible as to Charles IX.'s foreign policy and his preparations to fight Philip II. in Flanders with a Huguenot army under Coligny's command; this policy is incompatible with a plan to massacre the very men who were to carry out his design.

326. The Church had no Part in the Crime. — The massacre was a purely political crime with which the Church had nothing to do. In her balancing policy Catharine sided nearly as often with the Calvinists as with the Catholics. She was so little influenced by religious motives that she advised queen Elisabeth to deal with the Catholics of England as she had dealt with the Huguenots of France. Not a single ecclesiastical person was present at the Council of August 23. The whole action of Gregory XIII., his strenuous opposition to the marriage and his final refusal of a dispensation conclusively shows that he had nothing to do with a crime in which the marriage played so important a part according to Calvinist charges, as a means to gather the Huguenot leaders in Paris. Charles IX. took the responsibility of the act upon himself, and declared before the Parliament of Paris, that Coligny and his followers had conspired against the royal

family to raise Condé to the throne; and to usurp the royal power himself after Condé's removal. In his reports to the courts of Christendom he declared the deed an act of self-defense, whereby "on a memorable night by the destruction of a few seditious men the king had been delivered of immediate danger of death, and the realm from the perpetual terror of civil war." The words of the royal wretch certainly do not prove the truth of his allegations, but they prove that no attempt was made to give the massacre anything but a political color.

327. The Real Motives. — The real motives of the crime were: (a) Catherine's sudden alarm and real danger. (b) The hatred of the Guises on account of the assassination of their father. (c) The intense animosity of party spirit fed by years of sanguinary strife. (d) The unpopularity of Coligny and the Huguenots with the bulk of the nation. They formed but one thirtieth of the population. They had surrendered Havre and Dieppe to the English, the country's hereditary foes. They fought their battles with German, English, Dutch and Danish mercenaries, ruled a state within the state independently of any control and concluded treaties with foreign princes. They paraded their hatred of the Catholics in the most offensive manner. Brequimaut wore a necklace composed of the ears of assassinated priests. Baron d'Adrets at Montbrison compelled the Catholic prisoners to leap from the battlements into the upraised pikes of his soldiers. The *Michelade* at Nismes and similar massacres of Catholics were fresh in the memory of all. To these public causes must be added private animosities as they are apt to break forth in times of sudden and great commotions.

328. The Number of Victims. — The number of victims as estimated by Calvinist writers varies all the way between 4,000 and 100,000. Two contemporary writers, La Popelinière and Papyre Masson give, the first 1,000, the second 2,000 for Paris. The Calvinist Martyrologist procured from the ministers in the different towns where the massacres had taken place, lists of the names of the persons who had suffered or were supposed to have suffered. The result published in 1582 gave the names of not more than 786 persons. According to a document in the archives of the city hall, 20 livres were voted to the sextons of Paris for burying 1,100 bodies. As time went on, the number of victims as recorded by historians increases. Masson in 1573 estimates the number for all France at 10,000, La Popelinière in 1581 at 20,000, de Thou in 1604 at 30,000, Duvila in 1630 at 40,000, and Perefixe in 1661 at 100,000. Cardinal Hergenroether's estimate of between 2,000 and 3,000 in all France is now shared by most of responsible historians. It is a matter of fact, that the Huguenots lost little of their political influence, and were strong enough after the massacre to engage the power of France in five additional civil wars.

329. Te Deum and Other Festivities in Rome. — The Te Deum sung at Rome by Gregory XIII. cannot be tortured into an approval of the

lawless massacre. The soul of the Roman festivities was Charles, Cardinal of Lorraine, who considered the massacre as a victory of his House. The first official reports arrived at the papal court September 5th. The report of the French court put the chief stress on the pretended Huguenot plot to murder the king, the queen-mother, the princes and the Catholic leaders, and on the deliverance of the Catholics from a cruel persecution. The report of Salviati, the papal nuncio, was silent about a Huguenot plot, and gave a faithful account of the massacre. Whilst, then, Gregory XIII. ordered a Te Deum to be sung in thanksgiving for the escape of the royal House and the deliverance of the Catholics from a relentless foe, he bewailed with tears in his eyes the lawless method adopted by the French king, and left no doubt as to his horror of the deed. The harassed Catholics of France could hardly be blamed for rejoicing, not over a criminal massacre, but over the peace and safety which they fondly expected the event would bring to their country.

330. The Fourth Civil War, 1572–73. — The fourth civil war consisted of revolts in the southern provinces and the defense of the Huguenot stronghold of La Rochelle against the Catholic army under the duke of Anjou. During the siege a Polish embassy brought the news that Anjou, upon the advocacy of his mother, had been chosen king of Poland by the national diet of that electoral kingdom. The acceptance of the Polish crown by the duke paved the way to the Peace of La Rochelle, which granted the Huguenots amnesty, restoration of property and honor, freedom of conscience and freedom of worship in La Rochelle and some other Calvinist towns and in the homes of the feudal nobles. The Huguenots thus remained an independent military party with their garrisoned places of safety and an army of 20,000 men in the field.

Daniel, S. J. *History of France*: *Henry II. and Francis II.*, vol. 3. *Charles IX.*, vol. 4. — Duc d'Aumale-Borthwick: *History of the Princes of Condé:* Book I. *Louis de Bourbon*, vols. 1 and 2; E. R. '69, 2, p. 355; Q. R. '69, 2. — Lingard: *Hist. of England: Elisabeth*, vols. 7 and 8. — J. M. Stone: *Queen Elisabeth's Intrigues with the Huguenots*, D. R. '93, p. 599; *The Preparations for St. Bartholomew:* D. R. ' 94, 4, p. 358. — W. Loughnan: *St. Bartholomew's Day*, M. '90, 1, p. 175; C. T. S. P., vol. 17. — R. Parsons: *The Attempted Protestantization of France: Studies*, vol. 3, p. 360; *The Massacre of St. Bartholomew's Day*, p. 393. — Humphrey J. Desmond: *Mooted Questions of History, no. XX.: The Massacre of St. Bartholomew's.* — Spalding: *Reformation in France*: *The Huguenots*, v. 2, ch. 8. — Cobbett-Gasquet: *A Hist. of the Reformation: Elisabeth*, chaps. 9 and 10. — H. Bordier: *La Saint Barthélemy et la critique moderne.* — Lefortier: *Saint Barthélemy et les premieres guerres de religion en France. — L'entrevue de Bayonne et la question de la St. Barthélemy.* — Ch. Buet: *L'amiral de Coligny et les guerres de religion, etc.* — Kervyn de Lettenhove: *Les Huguenots et les Gueux* (1566–1585). — Delaborde: *Gaspard de Coligny.* — Duhr: *Zur Vorgeschichte der Bartholomäusnacht:* St. v. 29, p. 116; *Rom's Stellung zur Bartholomäusnacht*, p. 263. — H. Wuttke — Müller-Frauenstein: *Zur Vorgeschichte der Bartholomäusnacht.* — Baumgarten: *Vor der Bartholomäusnacht.* — Imbert de Saint Amand: ***Marguerite of Angoulême; Catharine de Medici and her Contemporaries.***

§ 3.

THE HOLY LEAGUE AND THE WAR OF THE THREE HENRYS.

331. Accession of Henry III. and Fifth Civil War, 1574–76. — About this time a new party of compromisers under the auspices of the House of Montmorency began to revive the wretched policy of L'Hôpital. They called themselves Politicians, declaimed against the influence of foreigners, and aimed at the overthrow of the Guises and the removal of Catharine. Catholics though they were, they advocated an alliance with the Huguenots, and recognized the king's youngest brother, Francis, duke of Alençon, as their head. Amidst party negotiations, local risings, and warlike preparations, Charles IX. died in 1574. The crown passed to Henry of Anjou, who gladly exchanged the turbulence of the Polish for the effeminacy of the French court. A victim of the lowest vices he allowed Catharine to pursue her double-dealing policy. The fifth war resulted from the union of the Politicians with the Huguenots, forming the powerful party of the Malcontents. Their foreign alliances with the Calvinist party of Germany and Elisabeth of England, and their supremacy in the field obtained for the Huguenots most favorable terms in the Peace of Boilieu: freedom of worship in all France, except at the court and in Paris, admission to the Parliaments and state-offices, and eight additional places of safety. Henry of Navarre was intrusted with the government of Guienne, Condé with Picardy, and Alençon, now duke of Anjou, with Berry, Touraine, and Anjou.

332. Sixth and Seventh Civil Wars, 1576–77 and 1579–80. — When the Catholics saw that the unity of religion was being sacrificed by the king they organized the Holy League for the defense of Catholicism under the direction of Henry of Guise. The League spread like lightning over the whole face of France. The Catholic noblesse, supported by the clergy and the populace, and opposed to the confederacy of Huguenot princes and Politicians, flocked to the standard of the League. The queen mother this time siding with the Catholics, succeeded in detaching Anjou from the Politicians. To retain a semblance of power Henry III. reluctantly

assumed the leadership of the League, 1576. In the States General at Blois, December, 1576, the king declared the Catholic faith the only lawful religion of the kingdom. This led to the sixth civil war in which the Huguenots, notwithstanding their reverses in the field, regained nearly all the advantages of the Peace of Boilieu. This compromise is called the Peace of Bergerac, 1577. The two Leagues were ordered to disband.

When the Leaguers on both sides disregarded the order and remained under arms, Catharine executed a new flank movement. In a conference at Nérac, the home of king Henry of Navarre, she increased the privileges of the Huguenots and gave them additional places of safety in pledge, 1579. But the young Huguenots of noble birth, "the gallants" who had tasted the sweets of civil war, were eager for more fray. "They wished for war for its own sake, for plunder, adventure and revenge," and induced Henry to renew hostilities. The Catholics had by far the best of the war, and the insurrection might have been extinguished had not a fresh disturbing cause changed the aspect of affairs. Towards the latter part of 1580 the provinces of the Netherlands in revolt against Philip II., offered the sovereignty over themselves to Francis, duke of Anjou. The duke urged his brother to come to terms with the Huguenots, promising him the pacification of France through a war against Spain. Accordingly a peace was signed at Fleix, November, 1580. The terms were those of Bergerac unchanged.

333. Causes of the Eighth War, 1585–88. — The death of Francis, duke of Anjou, and the childless condition of Henry III. brought the question of succession to the foreground. Henry of Navarre claimed the succession on the ground of nearest relationship to the king. But the ancient law of France excluded non-Catholics and excommunicated persons from the right of succeeding. This law was still recognized as binding by the Parliament and the University of Paris, the bulk of the population, and by Sixtus V., 1585. The Holy League which had disbanded during the period of peace, armed again and occupied a number of cities. Henry of Guise put up Charles Cardinal Bourbon as candidate for the crown. Philip II. of Spain promised to support his candidature on account of the help which Henry III. was tendering his enemies in the Netherlands. Henry III. frightened at the prospect of a new war, invoked the mediation of his mother. Catharine concluded with the Holy League the treaty of Nemours which forbade the exercise of the new faith,

and banished the Calvinists who would not return to the Church within the next six months. This was the only measure in the reign of Henry III. which brought him a gleam of popularity. The treaty of Nemours caused the eighth war, called the War of the Three Henrys, Henry III., Henry of Navarre, and Henry of Guise.

334. Beginning of the War of the Three Henrys. — In 1587 Henry of Navarre won the splendid victory of Coutras, but made so little use of it that Henry of Guise was enabled to rout in two battles the 36,000 auxiliaries which the Protestant princes had sent into France, and to drive them out of the country with terrible loss. Henry III. again wavered between the two parties. He was thought to be on the point of declaring Henry of Navarre his successor and of sacrificing the Catholic religion. The city of Paris, disgusted with the king's everlasting vacillation, had meanwhile formed a special union, the "Council of Sixteen," representing the sixteen quarters or wards of the city. Henry of Guise, invited by the sixteen, came to Paris accompanied by only fifteen horsemen. The king who had forbidden his coming, concentrated a force of Swiss guards in Paris, to keep the population in check. But the citizens who adored the chivalrous duke and intended to make him their candidate for the throne, as a descendant of the Carolingian House, flew to arms, raised barricades, and induced the soldiers to lay down their arms. It was owing to the restraining influence of Guise that the revolution was accomplished without cruelties or bloodshed. This "Day of the Barricades," May 12, 1588, made Henry of Guise master of Paris and of the situation, whilst the king left his capital a fugitive. To save appearances, Henry III. named Guise lieutenant-general of the realm.

335. Assassination of the Guises. — The queen-mother and the papal legate Morosini brought about a temporary reconciliation between the king and the League. The States General were summoned and met at Blois. France sent only members in full sympathy with the Holy League. Here an edict, issued at Rouen, which excluded the Protestant princes from the succession, was made a fundamental law of the kingdom. But Henry III. was not to be relied upon. Before the principal guests had left Blois, the king's

unconquerable jealousy of the Guises made him a murderer. On the evening of December 22, he ordered fifteen or twenty of his gentlemen to remain all night in the castle. Early next morning he initiated them to his plan of assassination; some were to seize the duke of Guise by the arms the moment he entered the chamber, others were to deprive him of his sword, others again to stab him. Whilst the council met in the council hall, a message arrived from the king demanding the duke's immediate presence in his private chamber. The duke obeyed at once, and on entering the room was instantly surrounded and stabbed. Uttering one loud cry: "This is for my sins," he expired. Cardinal de Guise in the council chamber recognizing his brother's voice sprang to his feet to hasten to his aid, but the king's attendants with drawn swords barred his passage. On the morning of the 24th Cardinal de Guise was strangled in the room where he had been kept a prisoner since the death of his brother. Many leaders of the League were seized and imprisoned. The third brother of Henry of Guise, the duke of Mayenne, not being present at Blois, escaped the emissaries of the royal murderer, and was at once acknowledged as the head of the Holy League. Catharine de' Medici died two weeks after the murder.

336. Assassination of Henry III. — The murder of the Guises stirred up all France. Orleans rose on the very day of the bloody deed. Within two weeks the revolt spread to the whole country. Seventy doctors of the Sorbonne declared the people released from the oath of obedience to Henry III. Almost all the large towns of France accepted the declaration. Sixtus V. demanded satisfaction especially for the murder of the Cardinal. Paris instituted a provisional government and conferred the powers of a regent on the duke of Mayenne till the next meeting of the States General. Henry III., face to face with infuriated France, deprived of his mother's shrewd counsel, and threatened by Mayenne's army, threw himself openly into the arms of Henry of Navarre. Both marched against Paris. In the suburb of St. Cloud the career of the last Valois came suddenly to an end. The young Dominican Clement, a half-witted person who, brooding over the evils of France, had turned into a fanatic, plunged his dagger into the king's body. The dying Henry III. named Henry of Navarre

his successor, imploring him at the same time to embrace the Catholic faith, Aug. 2, 1589. Henry of Navarre promised him to return to the Church, and to restore the Catholic religion.

Daniel: *Hist. of France,* Henry III., vol. 4.—D'Aumale: *Hist. of the Princes of Conde;* book 2, *Henri de Bourbon;* book 3, *Henri II. de Bourbon,* vol. 2.—Bain: *The Polish Interregnum, 1575,* E. H. R., v. 4, p. 644.—Wilbert: *Henry IV. and the Huguenots.*—G. Mason: *The Huguenots.*—Armstrong: *Wars of Religion.*—Blair: *Henry IV. and the Religious Wars.*—Macdowall: *Henry of Guise.*—Forneron: *Ducs de Guise et leur époque.*—H. Brown: *The Assassination of the Guises as described by the Venetian Ambassador,* E. H. R., v. 10, p. 304.—Kervyn de Lettenhove: *Les Huguenots et les Gueux* (—1585).—Vict. de Meaux: *Les Luttes religieuses ou France au XVI. siècle.*—G. Pigot: *Histoire des Etats Généraux.*—*Nouvelle Collections des mémoires relatifs à l'Histoire de France, VII.-X.*

§ 4.

TERMINATION OF THE STRUGGLE — HENRY IV., THE FIRST BOURBON KING, 1589–1610.

337. Continuation of the War. — The war continued, but to a great degree lost its religious character. Though Henry delayed his return to Catholicity longer than he had promised, he treated the Catholics with great fairness, and pledged himself to maintain the Catholic religion in France. Many Catholic nobles paid homage to him, because he represented the hereditary right as a descendant of Louis the Saint. The contest became a war of succession between Henry IV. and Charles Cardinal Bourbon, who assumed the title of Charles X. The Cardinal had the support of the League and Philip II. of Spain. Henry IV., after throwing garrisons into several towns of Normandy, proceeded to the second siege of the capital. At Ivry, near Paris, he defeated the duke of Mayenne, 1590. But Paris was relieved by Alexander Farnese, the great general of Philip II. The same commander frustrated Henry's attempt to conquer Rouen, 1592.

338. Conversion and Absolution of Henry IV. — Henry IV. became convinced that he would not be able to rule France as a Calvinist. After due study and preparation he made his profession of faith at St. Denis, 1593, and was crowned at Chartres. This step disarmed many of his Catholic opponents who left the League. Paris opened her gates in 1594. The duke of Mayenne with the remainder of the League maintained his previous position, waiting

for the action of the Holy See. The influence of Spain was strong at the papal court, and it was difficult to convince Clement VIII. of the sincerity of Navarre's conversion. At last, in September, 1595, the Pope solemnly absolved Henry from all censures, whereupon the duke of Mayenne acknowledged him as king of France and disbanded the League. The war with Spain was terminated by the Peace of Vervins, 1598, on the basis of a mutual restoration of conquests.

339. The Edict of Nantes, 1598. — The Calvinists expressed their dissatisfaction with the king's return to the Church by repeated revolts. To settle the religious dissensions at home Henry published in 1598 the famous Edict of Nantes. By this decree Catholic worship was restored, wherever it had been suppressed by the Calvinists, viz., in 300 towns and 1,000 country parishes. Calvinist worship was prohibited in all episcopal and archiepiscopal cities, at the court, at Paris and within a belt of five miles around the capital, and in a few other places determined by law. The Calvinists, who now numbered 750 communities, obtained, (a) freedom of conscience in all France, (b) freedom of worship, with the right of building churches, schools and seminaries, and holding consistories and synods in the free domains of Calvinist nobles and in other places determined by law, (c) representation in the Parliaments and equal political rights with the Catholics, (d) the permission of retaining the places of safety, which they still held, for the next eight years. The edict put an end for the time, to active hostilities, but could not lead to lasting peace, as long as the Calvinists retained their garrisoned places of safety, and were allowed to form a state within the state.

340. Last Years of Henry IV. — The period of internal tranquillity which succeeded the civil wars was employed by Henry IV. in restoring the prosperity of France by extensive financial and commercial reforms under the direction of his chief minister and friend, the duke of Sully. Notwithstanding his return to the Church, Henry's private life was scandalous, while in his external relations he followed the policy of his predecessors, in supporting the German Protestants, especially the powerful party of Calvinist princes founded by the Palatine House. His alliances with Elisabeth, the United Provinces, Savoy, the Calvinist princes of Germany, were in-

spired by a passionate desire of destroying the House of Hapsburg. His warlike preparations for an invasion of northern Germany (the duchy of Cleves) were arrested by the dagger of a miscreant named Ravaillac, who stabbed the king two days before his intended departure for the front. The assassin had no accomplices. "His only advisers were his own folly and the devil," said Cardinal Richelieu.

R. Parsons: *The Conversion of Henry IV. of France — Studies:* vol. 3, p. 420; *The Pontificate of Sixtus V.*, p. 536; *The Pontificate of Clement VIII.*, p. 550. — Daniel: *Hist. of France, Henry IV.*, vol. 4. — Kitchin: vol. 2, and *other histories of France.* — Johnson: *Europe in the Sixteenth Century: IX., The Reformation and Civil Wars in France.— Henry IV. of France*, Q. R. '79, 4. — Guizot: *Henry IV. and the End of the Wars of Religion.* — Sugenheim: *Frankreichs Einfluss auf und Beziehungen zu Deutschland.* — Dr. Bellesheim: *Das Erste Jahrhundert des Protestantismus in Frankreich*, H. P. B., vol. 85, pp. 296, 352. — Hergenroether, K. G., vol. 2, pp. 357–370, and other *Church Histories.*— Von Weiss: *Die Huguenotten Kriege*, vol. 8. Contemporary *Memoires*, by Marguerite de Valois; Montluc; Sully; Tavannes, de Thou.

CHAPTER II.

PHILIP II., MARY STUART AND ELISABETH.

§ 1.

PHILIP II., KING OF SPAIN, 1555–1598.

341. Philip's Family.


PHILIP, married
1. Mary of Portugal.
2. Mary, the Catholic.
3. Elisabeth of Valois.
4. Anne of Austria, daughter of Maximilian II.
Don Carlos.
Isabella Clara Eugenia, m. Archduke Albrecht, rulers of the Netherlands.
PHILIP III., 1598–1621.

342. Philip and Protestantism. — The government of Philip II. began under favorable auspices. The successes of Alva in Italy (no. 277) and count Egmont in the Netherlands (*ibid.*), and the subsequent treaties of peace with the Holy See, and with France at Cateau Cambresis, gave Philip military prestige and reputation for wisdom and moderation. His aim and desire was, from the retirement of his beloved Spain, to stem the further progress of Protestantism in Europe with all the means of statesmanship, and if needs be, of force. To remove the few traces of Protestantism in Spain required only a few acts of the Inquisition, a small number of executions. Thus a very limited display of rigor at the proper time saved Spain from the evils of civil and religious wars, which ravaged other countries during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

343. Philip and Don Carlos. — When Philip arrived in Spain he found his only son, Don Carlos, on the way of becoming a bodily and mental wreck. He was subject to periodical fevers, and, at times, given to reckless gluttony and imprudence, bursts of passion, and acts of wanton cruelty. Two of his ancestors, the unfortunate Joanna (daughter of Isabella the Catholic), and her grandmother, Isabella of Portugal, had been insane. Through four generations the courts of Spain and Portugal had constantly intermarried. For seventeen years Philip gave him the strongest proofs of fatherly care, and

surrounded him with the best instructors and attendants; he had him proclaimed heir to the crown of Castile, and made him member of the Council of ministers and President of the Council of State. Don Carlos, finding himself thwarted in his plan of marrying an Austrian princess, whereby he hoped to obtain greater political independence, conceived an implacable hatred against the king and his advisers, and gave vent to his passion not only in the presence of the first nobles of the kingdom but even in the Cortes (the chamber of the deputies), whilst he scandalized court and city by most disgraceful excesses. Philip became convinced that Don Carlos would be mentally and morally unfit to assume the duties of a ruler. Accordingly, in January, 1568, Don Carlos was confined in his own apartments, cut off from all communications with the outside world, placed for life under the supervision of eight noblemen, but otherwise treated like a prince. He died in July of the same year. Before his death a great change came over him. His preparation for death was most edifying. He received the last sacraments and died reconciled with his father and all who had formerly opposed him. The behavior of his son had been to Philip a source of intense suffering; he took the final step, after long deliberation and ordering prayers in the whole kingdom, guided by a sense of stern and disinterested duty. Though there was something morbid and undeveloped in the mind and character of Don Carlos, his excesses will hardly bear out the theory of such insanity as would destroy his responsibility for his acts. The charges, that Don Carlos was too intimate with the queen (Elisabeth of Valois), or that he was a secret Protestant, or that he sympathized with the rebellious Netherlanders, or that he planned the dethronement of his father and a change in the system of government, or that he was sentenced by the Inquisition or poisoned at Philip's command, are mere inventions of irresponsible romance-writers, not history.

344. Philip and the Moriscos. — Spain harbored another and far greater source of internal division and danger than Protestantism had been. The Moriscos or baptized Moors in Granada, in spite of the severe legislation of Ferdinand the Catholic and Charles V., continued to practice their Mohammedan religion and national customs. They acted as the secret allies of the pirates of Turkey and the Barbary coast who plundered the ports and estuaries of Spain, and received aid from the Algerian squadrons of Barbarossa. In Granada they broke forth from their mountain fastnesses, slew the men and sold the Christian women and children into slavery. In the interest of religion and a united monarchy Philip undertook to make them Christians and Spaniards. After some preliminary decrees a law was issued in 1566 which required the Moriscos to exchange within

three years, the Arabic for the Castilian tongue, and, within two years, their national for the Spanish costume; certain usages leading to effeminacy and lust were prohibited under severe penalties. These decrees led to a general rising of the Moors in 1569. They chose a king (Aben Humeya) descending from the ancient royal family and after his assassination by one of his wives, a successor in the person of Abn-Abo. The whole Christian population living within the reach of the rebels, suffered a most cruel martyrdom, not a single one saving himself by an act of apostasy. Don John of Austria, the king's half-brother, just returned from his first brilliant campaign as admiral-general against the north-African corsairs, was appointed commander-in-chief against the Moriscos. The war, described by Mendoza, was replete with deeds both of heroic daring and excessive cruelty on either side. By 1571 the force of the rebellion had spent itself. To break up the separate national existence of the Moors, Philip confiscated all the Moorish land in Granada, and transplanted the conquered nation into the provinces of Mancha, Castile, Estramadura and Galicia. The transfer of the people and their movable property was effected without cruelty and with due regard to the personal comfort of the exiles, and compares most favorably with the Plantations of Elisabeth and Cromwell in Catholic Ireland.

Once more the Moriscos rose under Philip III., when the remnants of the Moorish population were deprived of Spanish citizenship and forced to emigrate to Africa.

345. The Battle of Lepanto. — Whilst Elisabeth of England, the kings of France and the German Protestants, time and again allied themselves with the Turks against Catholic nations, Philip II. was consistent in his fight against the enemy of the Christian name. Appealed to by St. Pius V. in 1570 to aid the Christians of Cyprus, who were being attacked by the fleet of Selim II., Suleyman's successor, he concluded with the Pope and the Republic of Venice the Holy League against the Turks and the Moors of northern Africa. As head of the League Pius V. appointed Don John of Austria, the half-brother of Philip II., commander-in-chief of the allied forces. Nearly all the great Catholic captains of the time, Andrea Doria of

Genoa, the grand commander Requesens, the marquis of Santa Cruz, the young Alexander of Parma, were gathered around Don John. The Christian fleet was too late to save Cyprus, but it met the Mohammedan fleet, 300 vessels, manned by 120,000 men, at Lepanto. The Catholic fleet of 264 vessels, carrying 26,000 soldiers and 50,000 rowers, not only defeated but almost annihilated the enemy in the greatest naval battle of the century, and forever destroyed the Turkish supremacy in the Mediterranean, October 7, 1571.

The immediate results did not correspond to the greatness of the victory, owing to the habitual indecision of Philip II., the death of Pius V., the soul of the League, in 1572, and the mercenary policy of Venice, which in violation of the terms of the League, by a separate peace, traded away the island of Cyprus for the restoration of her commercial privileges. Don John of Austria, dreaming of an independent Christian principality in Africa, conquered Tunis in 1574. But the jealousy of Philip II. left him without the necessary support, and Tunis and even Goletta, the conquest of Charles V., were again subjected to the Crescent.

346. The Succession in Portugal.

EMMANUEL THE GREAT, d. 1521.

- *Isabella*, m. Charles V.
  - **PHILIP II.**, 1580–98.
- **JOHN III.**, 1521–1557, m. *Catharine*, daughter of Charles V.; *Regent* for Sebastian, 1557–62.
  - John, the Infante, d. 1554.
    - **SEBASTIAN**, 1557–1578.
- Cardinal **HENRY**, Regent for Sebastian, 1562–68. **KING**, 1578–80.
- Edward
  - *Catharine*, duchess of Braganza.
    - Theodosius.
      - **JOHN IV.**, of Braganza.

347. The Conquest of Portugal. — Sebastian, the last king of Portugal descended from Robert, duke of Burgundy (vol. I, nos. 344 and 555), a high-soaring character, undertook, at the head of 15,000 men of all arms, an expedition to northern Africa for the purpose of conquering Fez and Morocco. Attacked and surrounded by four times their number of Moors on the plains of Alcazar, the Christian army was so completely defeated that hardly 1000 remained to tell the tale. King Sebastian was among the slain, 1578. His grand-uncle, Cardinal Henry, succeeded him till 1580. Of the seven candidates who after the Cardinal's death

claimed the succession, Phillip II. had the best right and the strongest means to enforce his claim. He intrusted the task of taking possession to the duke of Alva by land, and the marquis of Santa Cruz by sea. The former defeated Antonio, an illegitimate pretender supported by the people, and his 10,000 followers at Alcantara, the latter received the surrender of the Portuguese fleet. The fortresses opened their gates without resistance. The country submitted, but with bitter feelings of national jealousy intensified by the cruel conduct of the Spanish troops. When Philip II., however, held his entry in Lisbon, 1582, he was received with universal enthusiasm, in the vain hope that Philip would restore Portugal's greatness. The Portuguese colonies in America, Africa, and the Indies followed the example of the mother country; only the Azores had to be subdued by force.

No real union of the two nations was effected by the conquest. Philip, who ruled the country from Madrid for the benefit of Spain, and his successors, had to content themselves with the sullen submission of the Portuguese. During the reign of Philip II. the people refused to believe in the death of Sebastian, though at least six Portuguese had seen him dead on the battlefield, and his body had been brought to Ceuta, and interred in the royal tombs at Belem. Hence successive impostors mostly from the lower class of the people, rose and gave themselves out as the lost Sebastian and were executed. The last of these "false Sebastians" was still in prison when Philip II. died. In 1640, under Philip IV. an almost bloodless revolution made an end to the Spanish dominion, raised the House of Braganza in the person of John IV. to the throne, and re-established the independence of Portugal.

R. Baumstark: *Philip II.*; *Koenig von Spanien.* — W. H. Prescott: *History of the Reign of Philip II.* — Watson: *History of the Reign of Philip II.* — Hume: *Life of Philip II.* (*Foreign Statesmen*). — Forneron: *Histoire de Philippe II.* — Alex. Dumesnil: *Hist. de Philippe II. roi d'Espagne.* — Gams: *Die Kirchengeschichte Spaniens*, vol. 3, part 2, p. 251. — M. Gachard: *Don Carlos et Philippe II.* — Wilfrid C. Robinson: *The True Story of Don Carlos:* M. '81, p. 546. — W. Mauerbrecher: *Don Carlos.* — Falloux: *Life of St. Pius V.* — Mariana: *Historia de Rebus Hispanicis.* — Poullet: *Correspondance de Card. Granvella.* — Bruslé de Montpleinchamp: *Vie de D. Juan d'Autriche.* — Stirling-Maxwell: *Don John of Austria* (*Battle of Lepanto*, chs. 13-15). — Hale: *Story of Spain.* — Stephens: *Story of Portugal.* — H. Schäfer: *Gesch. von Portugal.* — Dunham; Busk: *History of Spain and Portugal.* — Archibald J. Dunn: *The Rise and Decay of the Rule of Islam;* part 3: *The Rise, Progress and Decay of the Turkish Empire.* — Ranke: *Fürsten und Völker in Südeuropa im 16ten und 17ten Jahrh.* (*the Spanish and Ottoman Empires*). — Albert de Circourt: *Hist. des Arabes d'Espagne.* — Hammer; *Zinkeisen and other Hist. of Turkey.* (On Philip II. see also works under the following §§).

§ 2.

THE REVOLT OF THE NETHERLANDS — CAUSES OF DISAFFECTION.

348. The Netherlands. — The Low Countries which in 1555 passed from the rule of Charles V. to that of his son, Philip II., comprised seventeen provinces, thickly populated by thrifty peoples of different race and language, Dutchmen, Flemings, Germans and French-speaking Walloons. Of the provinces four were duchies: Brabant, Gelderland, Limburg and Luxemburg; five were lordships: Friesland, Mechlin, Utrecht, Overyssel and Gröningen; seven were counties: Flanders, Artois, Hainault, Holland, Zeeland, Namur, Zutphen. Antwerp was a margravate. On account of their flourishing agriculture, commerce and industries, especially weaving, they formed one of the richest countries of Europe. They numbered 200 walled cities, 250 open towns and over 6,000 villages. Brussels, in the province of Brabant, was the seat of the central government. The Stadtholder, who governed in the name of the prince, was assisted by a privy council, a court of finances, and a council of state composed of the greater nobles, and intrusted with the management of foreign affairs and a general supervision over the other councils. Under Charles V. the administration had been in the hands of his aunt, Margaret of Savoy (1506–1530) and his sister Mary, queen of Hungary. The States of each province and the States-General alone had the power of granting the subsidies required by the provincial or general government. In their relation to the Empire the Netherlands formed the Burgundian circle, without, however, being subject to the diet or the imperial Chamber.

349. Philip's Unpopularity. — The personal contrast between Charles V. and his son made an unfavorable impression on the people. For though Charles' rule had been stern even to harshness, — thus e. g. he had punished a tax revolt in Ghent, his own native city, with the utmost severity — the people loved him; he was born in their country, was one of them, spoke their language, moved with easy familiarity among all classes of the people, and took part in their games and festivities. They were a warlike people; his glory was their glory. Philip II. on the other hand was a Spaniard, externally cold and reserved, shy of public display, unable to speak the language of the country, and averse to warlike exercises or athletic sports.

Besides this personal contrast, there existed a national antipathy between the poor but haughty Spaniards, and the rich, busy and comfortable Netherlanders.

350. Impoverishment of the Nobles. — It is a mistaken view to ascribe the Revolution as a struggle of the people for freedom and independence against the tyranny of Philip II. Philip was no tyrant. During the period

preceding Alva's administration, he was not guilty of any breach of his word pledged to the nation or of any violation of its constitutional rights. He simply maintained the laws of Charles V., never challenged by the Netherlands, without adding or detracting anything. Hence the revolt did not proceed from the people, from the nation, but from the nobility. Not before Alva's iron administration did the struggle assume a national character. A great many nobles had impaired their fortunes in the wars of Charles V., or squandered them by an expensive and riotous life. Whilst the people blessed Philip's beneficence during the famine of 1556 and 1557, the nobles had little reason for similar gratitude. Unlike Charles, Philip gave them no lucrative positions, no share in the government of his larger Empire, and only a limited share in the government of the provinces. Deprived of both military and administrative employment, the nobility opposed the Spanish rule in the hope of retrieving their shattered fortunes by political changes.

351. The Spanish Troops. — Spanish troops to the number of 3,000 were retained in the Netherlands after the Peace of Cateau Cambresis to guard the French frontiers. The troops were paid partly by Spain, partly by the Provinces, and by both very irregularly, hence a number of soldier riots. Yet whilst William of Orange and count Horn made the presence of the Spanish troops a means of violent agitation against Philip, these very leaders were the commanders of the troops and purposely allowed them to commit excesses to make them hateful to the people. Philip was finally induced by his friends to withdraw them to Spain, which he did soon after his own departure.

352. Religion. — When Philip began his rule, the religious state of the Netherlands was better than that of Germany, France or England. No doubt, the Netherlands too had among many irreproachable churchmen their bad priests and religious, their lax monasteries and convents, and their clerical scandals connected with the abuse of wealth. The so-called "Guilds of Rhetoric" among the nobles, merchants and citizens, in pamphlets and lampoons, in dramatic representations and popular festivities, ridiculed Pope and monks, indulgences and pilgrimages and other religious institutions in the true spirit of radical humanism. The geographical position and the commercial connections of the Netherlands opened the country to the emissaries of English Protestantism, German Lutheranism and French Calvinism. But the edicts of Charles V. did something to check the religious agitation. Very harsh as they were in theory they had been issued with the full consent of the representatives of the people. The execution was much milder than the law, and in some provinces hardly felt. Hence they met little resistance. The edicts and the papal and episcopal inquisition introduced by Charles V. since 1522 would never have caused the Revolution without the political revolt which used them as a means of agitation.

It was not so much edicts and inquisitions, which kept the great mass of the people loyal to the Church, as the extraordinary influence of the University of Löwen (Louvain). It sent out its pious and well-trained scholars, writers, preachers, parish priests and religious into every part of the country as so many defenders of the faith. All the faculties of the University were united in the cause of Catholicity. The humanistic studies were cultivated on conservative lines. The teachers in the higher schools of the Netherlands were formed under the great Christian humanist Louis Vives. Thus it happened that in spite of the efforts of the radical humanists, and of a great deal of religious burrowing and undermining done by foreign preachers, not a single organized Protestant community was formed before 1560.

353. **Outcry against the New Hierarchy.** — The new hierarchy consisting of three archbishops and fourteen suffragans, established by Paul IV., was made another subject of agitation. The measure was simply necessary for the proper instruction of the people. The seventeen provinces densely populated as they were, had only three bishops and no archbishops. German and French prelates exercised jurisdiction over a great part of the country, and very often neglected their charge. Still, the new hierarchy was opposed by the abbots, because the new bishoprics were to be endowed with a part of the monastic revenues. Besides, the abbots had heretofore formed the chief estate of the clergy in the States General. As native citizens they voted with the national party. Henceforth the first place in the States would fall to the bishops, who as appointees of the king might be foreigners. The nobility charged Philip with violating his coronation oath by negotiating the measure with the Holy See without consulting the States General. But the king acted strictly within his right, as was proved by the concurrent testimony of all the faculties of the University. To the people the establishment was decried as the introduction of the *Spanish* Inquisition, though nobody thought of introducing the Spanish Inquisition in the Netherlands and Philip II. positively denied any intention of this kind.

354. William the Silent. — The principal cause, however, of the series of disturbances by which Holland and the northern provinces were torn from the rule of Spain, was the ambitious and treacherous course of William of Nassau, prince of Orange, called the Silent. Early in his reign the king had been deeply offended by William's second marriage with the daughter of Maurice of Saxony, the man who had so dastardly betrayed his father. In concluding this marriage, William pledged himself to the king, that his wife would live as a Catholic, and to the electors of Saxony that she would live as a Lutheran. As a matter of fact religion sat lightly

on the shoulders of Orange. Catholic at the court of Charles V., Lutheran when dealing with Lutheran princes, Calvinist, when his political interest suggested the change, he made himself the leader of the Protestants without losing the political support of prominent Catholics, such as count Egmont, the victor of Gravelines, and the admiral count Horn. At Philip's departure from the Netherlands in 1559, William the Silent received the government of several provinces, whilst he thought himself entitled to the regency over the whole country. He took, however, the oath of fidelity to the king of Spain.

Dr. F. J. Holzwarth: *Der Abfall der Niederlande*, vol. 1, ch. 1-5, pp. 1-135.— Baron Kervyn de Lettenhove: *Les Huguenots et les Gueux; Histoire de Flandre.* — Wilfrid C. Robinson: *The Revolt of the Netherlands; The Netherlands from 1555-1567*, M. '79, 2, p. 205.— Strada, S. J.: *De Bello Belgico.* — Mariana: *Historia de Rebus Hispanicis.* — J. L. Motley: *I. The Rise of the Dutch Republic*, 3 vols. *II. The History of the United Netherlands. The Life and Death of John of Barneveld.* Motley's Historical Works are brilliant literary productions, but from a historical point of view, misleading. The fundamental view of the *Rise of the Dutch Republic* is arbitrary and not corresponding with truth. William of Orange was *not* the national hero of the Netherlands, nor the founder of national and religious freedom. The "Rise" is a more elaborate companion work of Schiller's poetical: *Abfall der Niederlande.* — See about Schiller, Dr. J. Janssen: *Schiller als Historiker.— On Mr. Motley's Historical Works:* D. R. '78, 2.

§ 3.

ADMINISTRATION OF MARGARET OF PARMA — 1559–67.

355. Cardinal Granvella. — The regency, so ardently coveted by William the Silent, was bestowed by Philip upon his half-sister, Margaret of Parma. William's resentment was still further aggravated by the appointment of the statesman and prelate Granvella as adviser and prime minister to the regent. Granvella's elevation to the see of Mechlin, 1560, which made him the head of the new hierarchy, and to the Cardinalate, 1561, roused the hostility of the nobles who hated in him the man of humble descent, and the trusted counsellor of Phillip II. Granvella urged the king in all sincerity to adopt a policy of conciliation. But after remonstrating with his sovereign, he obeyed the royal orders and was inaccessible to public clamor. Thus all the blame of Philip's measures was thrown on the minister. Plots were formed to oust Granvella and to play the dominant power in the council of state into the hands of the disaffected nobles.

Political banquets in the palace of Orange preceded the storm. The country was flooded with lampoons and caricatures of the Cardinal. William the Silent, Egmont and Horn sent letter after letter to Philip II. complaining of Granvella's conduct. The regent gave too willing an ear to the disaffected party, and advised the Cardinal's removal. Granvella's recall in 1564 was a misfortune for the country; all order and religion seemed to depart with him. Margaret of Parma, flattered and bribed by the plotters, transferred her whole influence with Philip to the party which had struck at the Cardinal in order to strike at the king.

356. The Compromise of Breda. — Meanwhile the heresy made rapid progress in the provinces, especially in Holland and Western Flanders. The Anabaptists, with headquarters in Antwerp and Bruges, again reared their heads. Their ministers, who were chosen by a majority of the sectaries, assumed beside the function of preaching and baptizing, an extraordinary power over the marriage bond. Members were allowed to have four wives. If a wife became dissatisfied with the life of the sect, or otherwise objectionable to her husband, she was reported to the minister, taken out to the woods and killed by the minister's hand. There were ministers who had killed five or six of these unfortunates. Before being initiated to the sect of the "saints," the applicant had to undergo a candidature in stealing and murdering for four or five years. The adept was then admitted under terrible oaths; he knew that leaving the sect meant death. The number of those who were promoted to the highest class, "the inner sanctuary," was very small. They had to give proof by the silent endurance of excessive tortures, that they would reveal no secrets on the rack. No laws could be too severe to stamp out a sect of this character.

Whilst the native growth of Anabaptism was creeping in the dark, other forms of heresy came forth from their hiding-places into the public, or glided into the country from the Baltic, Scandinavian and English ports, or crossed the boundaries from Germany and France. Between 1564 and 1566, Lutheranism made some, Calvinism rapid progress, among the lower and poorer classes. Crowds of disguised Huguenots immigrated into the large cities, especially to Antwerp. The nobles began to abolish Mass in their castles, and to clamor for freedom of worship and preaching, for the use of churches, for a radical change in the administration of religious laws. The religious question was to be made the most powerful weapon against Spain. The leaders, especially William the Silent, corresponded with Philip

of Hesse, the dukes of Saxony and Würtemberg, for the right of levying troops in their countries, and intrigued with Coligny and Beza in France. In the midst of this turmoil arrived the stern dispatches of Philip II., issued October 20, 1565, which demanded in unmistakable language, that the religious laws of Charles V. should be executed in their whole severity. Thereupon a number of young nobles met in the palace of Orange at Breda, and drew up and signed the so-called Compromise of Breda, in which they promised to assist each other in bringing about the abolition of the religious edicts of Charles V. Whether William the Silent was present, is not known. He certainly did not sign the document. But the Compromise being circulated everywhere, the league rapidly increased in membership, and was guided by the secret councils of Orange, 1566.

357. The Gueux. — On April 5, 1566, four hundred "Confederates" who had signed the Compromise of Breda marched to the palace of Margaret of Parma at Brussels to urge the repeal of the religious edicts by the king and their immediate suspension by the regent. Margaret became alarmed when she saw the armed procession surrounded by an immense crowd of people. One of the loyal nobles to reassure her made the remark: "They are only a crowd of Gueux" (beggars). The Leaguers at a subsequent banquet adopted this designation as their party name. The procession was repeated the following day by an increased number of confederates and Margaret finally suspended the working of the religious edicts, except in cases of open rebellion or great excesses, until the king should give his final decision.

358. Meeting of Trond: Iconoclasm. — The Gueux availed themselves of this suspension, which they proclaimed as equivalent to freedom of worship, to call into the country a great number of Calvinist preachers from Geneva and France. They were followed across the borders by crowds of religious fugitives. They were joined by peasants, cobblers, women, apostate monks who were seized by the spirit and held forth to the excited mob. They flashed the phantom of the Spanish Inquisition before the eyes of people, though nobody ever thought of introducing it in the Netherlands. In the public meetings sedition was openly preached under

the protection of the Gueux. More and more numerous the hearers came in arms. The regent unsupported by Philip, the magistrates unsupported by the government, were powerless to stem the tide of revolt. In the assembly of Trond the Calvinist preachers and 2,000 confederates joined hands and passed the resolution to meet force with force in the defense of Lutheranism and Calvinism. The storm so long brewing burst on the eve of the Assumption, 1566. About 300 persons broke into the churches of St. Omer, destroying all they could lay hands on. Under the singing of psalms and the cry of "Long live the Beggars," the devastating mob of image-breakers swept from St. Omer to Lys, Valenciennes, Tournay, Antwerp, and thence on to the northern cities. Over 1,000 churches and monasteries were sacked in less than two weeks. Manuscripts, statuary, paintings, the masterpieces of Flemish art, fell under the blows of the Calvinistic fury, an irreparable loss, yet far surpassed in iniquity by the horrible desecrations of the Blessed Sacrament. Orange and the other leading confederates at Brussels constrained the regent by their threats to pardon the Gueux, and to allow the sectaries to hold their assemblies. The confederate nobles returning to their provinces still further enlarged these concessions on their own authority.

359. Last Measures of Margaret of Parma, 1567. — Encouraged by a strong Catholic reaction in the provinces, Margaret of Parma finally rose to the height of her position. She took vigorous means to restore order and security. The insurrection of Valenciennes supported by William's brother, Ludwig of Nassau, who had invaded the country at the head of an army, was put down by the capture of the rebellious city. Antwerp and other revolted places made their submission and accepted loyal garrisons. Catholic worship was everywhere restored, the preachers and foreign agitators were expelled. Many Catholics who had joined the confederates for political reasons, dismayed at the turn of affairs, returned to their allegiance. The king's officers and vassals were called upon to take a new oath of allegiance binding themselves to preserve the Catholic religion. Very few refused to take the oath, among them was William the Silent who withdrew with his whole household to Germany. Egmont and Horn submitted.

There can be no doubt about Philip's sincerity in protecting the Catholic religion. His own ambition was for religious and political unity in his vast Empire. "Rather than allow of the least thing that might be prejudicial to religion," he wrote to his ambassador at Rome, "or to the service of God, I would rather lose all my dominions and even my life a hundred times over." Yet a great responsibility for the outbreak rested on Philip II. himself. He was urged by his best friends, by his sister Margaret of Parma, by Granvella, by Pius V., to visit the Netherlands in person. He was lavish in promise, but could never tear himself away from Spain, profoundly grieved though he was by the crime of the image-breakers. Had he now maintained Margaret, or sent a prudent, firm and gentle ruler, the renewal of troubles already allayed might have been prevented. The outbreak had been the work of a small but resolute minority over-awing an immense majority of Catholics deprived of leadership and protection. Unfortunately Philip sent Ferdinando Alvarez de Toledo, duke of Alva, and Alva's reign of terror fanned the disaffection into a national revolt.

Holzwarth: *Der Abfall der Niederlande*, vol. 1, chapter 6-10, pp. 136-460. — W. C. Robinson: *The Revolt of the Netherlands; Cardinal Granvelle*, M. '79, 2, p. 472. — K. de Lettenhove: *Hug. et Gueux; Flandre.* — *Strada de Belle Belgico.* — Dr. Joh. Janssen: *Geschichte des deutschen Volkes; On the affairs of the Netherlands*, vol. 4, pp. 247-264. — Gachard: *Correspondance de Philippe II. sur les affaires des Pays-Bas.*— *Corresp. de Marguerite d'Autriche avec Ph. II.* — Poullet: *Corresp. de Cardinal Granvelle.*— M. Koch. *Untersuchungen über die Empörung und den Abfall der Niederländer* (*Quellen zur Gesch. K. Maximillan II.*).— Klose-Wuttke: *Wilhelm I. von Oranien.*— Th. Juste: *Histoire de la Revolution des Pays-Bas sous Philippe II.*—Dr. H. Leo: *Zwölf Bücher Niederländischer Geschichten* (parts 1 and 2).

§ 4.

ADMINISTRATION OF THE DUKE OF ALVA, 1567–1573.

360. Alva in the Low Countries. — The duke of Alva was above all a great soldier, immovably loyal to his king, irreproachable in his private life, but a rigorous disciplinarian who was guided in all his undertakings by a stern sense of duty. In May, 1567, he joined his army of 10,000 picked veterans on the plains of Lombardy, and crossing Mont Cenis, and passing through Savoy, Burgundy and Lorraine, reached the Netherlands in the middle of August. Philip II. had furnished him with the most exact instructions how to deal with the country. A few days after his arrival at Brussels he caused general dismay by arresting the counts Egmont and Horn and other notable leaders in the late disturbances. Margaret of Parma, whose feelings were deeply wounded by the mission of the *Captain-General*, resigned the regency and returned to Italy, fol-

lowed by the sincere regrets of the people. Early in 1568 Alva instituted the "Council of Troubles," which from its undoubted severity was soon dubbed the Council of Blood (Bloodraad).

The Council of Troubles was composed of twelve members nominated by Alva. This tribunal sent its agents into all parts of the country. The proceedings were ruled by the severe laws of Charles V. in conformity with the criminal procedure then in general use. The punishments, death, exile or prison, were very numerous, but reached as yet chiefly persons of the lower and middle classes. If inquisitors intervened it was rather to reclaim than condemn heretics. It is estimated, that during these troubles 100,000 persons emigrated; a great many to England, where they introduced the weaving loom, and greatly contributed to English prosperity.

361. Invasions. — Meanwhile Ludwig of Nassau invaded the Netherlands and defeated a detachment of Spanish troops at Heiligerlee. Alva declared the property of the prince of Orange, Ludwig of Nassau and other leaders forfeited to the crown, extended death sentences to the nobility and pushed on the trial of Egmont and Horn which ended in their execution, June, 1568.

Egmont had often acted impulsively and with great imprudence, but was probably innocent of high treason. Philip II. insisted on his execution. He died a most edifying death. Horn was a traitor and obtained his popularity only by sharing Egmont's fate. Four days after the execution of Egmont and Horn Alva wrote three letters to Philip bewailing the fate of the two noblemen and imploring his majesty's pity on Egmont's widow and children.

Having thus struck terror into the nation, Alva took the field, routed Ludwig of Nassau near Groeningen, and completely destroyed his invading forces at Jemmingen. In a second campaign the duke displayed his masterful strategy to such advantage against the prince of Orange, that the enemy had to change camps twenty-nine times without once obtaining a vantage ground for attacking Alva. The prince was forced to retire from the contest for want of provisions, 1568.

362. Taxation. — Alva had no money to pay his veterans; 800,000 ducats sent him by Philip were forcibly detained by the English queen. The unpaid Spanish soldiers displayed signs of mutiny and terrorized the people with acts of insolence, robbery and lawless violence. To make the occupation of the Netherlands self-supporting, Alva resorted to the imposition of heavy taxes. He first demanded the 100th, then the 20th, and finally the 10th

penny not only of the raw material but of every stage of the manufactured product. The result was that failures multiplied, prices rose enormously and trade and commerce were grievously hampered. The method of imposing the taxes not by a grant of the States, but by royal authority — a real violation of the rights of the country — exasperated the people still more than the amount of the taxes, and drove many otherwise well-intentioned people into the camp of William of Orange. This financial policy made Alva more hateful to the people than the continued executions and numerous decrees of exile passed by the Council of Troubles. Hence a modified reduction of the worst taxes and a very limited royal amnesty in 1570 made little impression beyond indicating that Philip regarded the religious struggle ended and that in the political struggle he was willing to grant pardons and concessions. The ecclesiastical affairs of the country were settled by the new hierarchy in the great provincial Council of Mechlin, 1570, which solemnly accepted the Council of Trent, and by its own enactments applied its reformatory decrees to the needs of the country.

363. **The Taking of Brill, 1572.** — The sufferings of the people were still more increased by the machinations of the Nassau brothers. After the failure of 1568 William the Silent withdrew to his German estate of Dillenburg whence he repeatedly offered peace to Spain, if the king would restore to him his property in the Netherlands. Secretly however he was indefatigable in seeking new allies and organizing his followers. In his interest the Bush Gueux, large bands of highwaymen reinforced by French rabble, carried on a guerrilla warfare and spread terror and devastation among the peasants and burghers of Flanders, Artois, Hainault and Tournay. His brother, Ludwig of Nassau, had gone to France and made common cause with the Huguenots. It was Coligny who pointed out to the brothers the weak point of the Spanish position, the lack of a fleet. The result was the organization of a large fleet of pirates, chiefly Calvinists, the "Water Gueux," who terrorized the seaboard of the low countries with inhuman atrocities; when pursued they found shelter and safety in La Rochelle and in Elisabeth's harbors. William the Silent pretending to act in the name of the king of Spain, issued their letters of marque, appointed their admirals, and received the lion's share of their booty. In 1572, he named William de la Mark, a monster in human shape, admiral of the Water Gueux. When Elisabeth, in one of her political shifts, ordered the Water Gueux to leave the English harbors, they suddenly appeared before Brill, and seizing that stronghold, laid the first foundation of the Dutch Republic. William the Silent's ardent desire was fulfilled. He had now a La Rochelle in the Netherlands.

364. William Stadtholder. — Brill became the starting-point for the conquest of Flushing, the island of Walcheren and nearly all the towns of northern Holland. In southern Holland, Leyden,

Dortrecht and other cities fell into the hands of the Gueux. Wherever they came they found the Catholics in a decided majority. Though these were disgusted with Alva's harsh rule, yet the proclamations of William the Silent were unable to rouse a shadow of enthusiasm. Accordingly the Calvinist assailants of any new town were lavish in promising the Catholics the safe enjoyment of their religious rights. But once being admitted they usually broke their engagements and committed cruelties, compared with which Alva's measures were child's play. Plundering of monasteries, sacking of churches, image-breaking again became the order of the day. William de la Mark added a new glory to the Church which he detested by inflicting inhuman tortures on men whose only crime was their sanctity, thus enriching the calendar of the Saints with the nineteen martyrs of Gorcum. By the middle of 1572 a large portion of the northern provinces was in the hands of the Gueux. The States of Holland represented by a small minority of Water Gueux, image-breakers and other Calvinists, in a meeting at Dortrecht, chose the absent William the Silent, Stadtholder of Holland, Zeeland, Friesland and Utrecht, and Protector of the Netherlands during the king's absence, thus keeping up the fiction of allegiance to the crown. The States undertook to raise a revenue for the Stadtholder.

365. The Southern Campaign. — Meanwhile the negotiations of William with the Huguenots of France had resulted in an agreement. When Charles IX. had thrown himself into the arms of Coligny, and entered upon his Protestant policy (no. 322), he promised Ludwig of Nassau to send Genlis with 5,000 men to the Netherlands, to be followed by a larger army under the command of Coligny. If the expedition should be successful, all the land between Antwerp and Picardy should fall to France, whilst William the Silent should acquire Holland, Zeeland and Friesland. Accordingly Ludwig of Nassau surprised Mons, while William took Gelders, Roermond, Mechlin and other towns. Alva hastened to the seat of war. His son, Don Ferdinand of Toledo, defeated the 5,000 Huguenots marching under Genlis to the relief of Mons. The duke himself routed the forces of Orange near Mons. The massacre of St. Bartholomew suddenly destroyed all hopes of further Huguenot relief, and Mons had to capitulate. The rebellion in the southern

provinces was crushed with terrible severity; Mechlin was plundered for three days.

366. The Northern Campaign. — Alva then turned to the north. Town after town fell before its army of victorious veterans. All the horrors of civil war ensued. Zutphen was taken after a feeble resistance, and its garrison put to the sword. Naarden was almost leveled to the ground. Haarlem resisted seven months, even its women taking part in the defense. Feats of desperate bravery and matchless devotion on both sides, but also of excessive cruelty marked this stubbornly contested but victorious campaign of Alva, his last in the Netherlands.

367. Alva Recalled, 1573. — Meanwhile all the different parties had united in a combined effort to dislodge Alva from his position. Deputations sent to Madrid found Philip II. willing to listen to their remonstrances. Alva himself, without money or supplies for his army, and abandoned by the king, asked for a successor, and Louis Zuñiga y Requesens, Grand Commander of the Order of St. James, was sent to replace him. Alva left for Spain in December, 1573.

In judging Alva we must not apply the standard of the present time to his actions. The legislation of the age, its cruel code of criminal procedure, its intolerance, its barbarity in warfare, were characteristic of the time. The venerable Louis of Granada, who assisted Alva on his death bed, assured his widow that the duke felt free of any mortal sin regarding the Netherlands. He committed grievous errors of judgment and flooded the Netherlands with blood and tears, but it was not innate cruelty, an insane thirst for blood, but a stern though misunderstood sense of justice which inspired his actions. He was a terrible man, but he was not a bad man.

Holzwarth: *Abfall der Niederlande*, vol. 2 (1566-1572), vol. 3, pp. 1-162.— W. C. Robinson: *The Revolt of the Netherlands; Alva's Reign of Terror*, M. '79, 3, p. 515; Prescott: *Philip II.* — M. Creighton: *Age of Elisabeth*, Book 3. — K. de Lettenhove; Strada; Gachard. — M. J. Spalding, vol. II., *The Reformation in the Netherlands.*— Von Weiss: *Aufstand in den Niederlanden; Weltgesch*, vol. 7. — Nuyens: *History of the Netherlandish Rebellion.* — Alzog-Byrne: vol. 3. — Lavisse-Rambaud: *Les Guerres de Religion, 1559-1648.*— W. C. Robinson: *William the Silent*, M. '79, 2, p. 507.— Alberdingk Thijm: *Abfall der Niederlande*: H. P.-B., vol. 7. pp. 275. — J. L. Motley: *Rise.* (Motley's Alva is a caricature, drawn not from state documents and authentic sources, but in nine cases out of ten from hot partisans of William, and bitter Calvinists. Hence his history of this period becomes a " chamber of horrors " which altogether eclipses that of Madam Toussaud " See D. R., '72, p. 35[illegible]

§ 5.

DON JOHN AND ALEXANDER FARNESE — FINAL SECESSION OF THE NETHERLANDS.

368. Administration of Requesens, 1573-76. — Requesens, a statesman of great prudence and moderation, worked sincerely for the pacification of the country. A fresh invasion of Ludwig of Nassau from Germany, 1574, forced him to take the field. He destroyed the invading army on the Mooker Heath where two brothers of William the Silent, Ludwig and Henry of Nassau, fell, 1574. Supported by the notables of the loyal provinces in his zeal to pacify the country, Requesens again offered the fairest terms to the revolting provinces. It was William of Orange who prevented the re-establishment of peace. Still Requesens, by his successful campaign, considerably reduced the area of the rebellion in the north. He died in 1576. Philip II. for a time transferred the government to the Council of State.

369. The Pacification of Ghent, 1576. — The acts of the Spanish troops gave a new impulse to the revolt. They had just conquered the important island of Schouwen which divides Holland from Zeeland. Not being paid all their arrears, they mutinied, marched to Flanders and took possession of Alost. The States of Brabant, then sitting at Brussels, and guided by agents of Orange, outlawed the Spanish soldiers, levied troops and arrested the loyal members of the Council of State. The curtailed Council summoned the States General to Brussels, whilst William the Silent and the deputies of Holland and Zeeland gathered at Ghent. Three deputies of both parties conferred on the pacification of the provinces. On account of the religious question the conferences were difficult and tedious, but all hesitation ceased, when the mutinous soldiers "the Spanish Fury," threw themselves on Antwerp, and overran the wealthy city with fire, murder and pillage. Accordingly the provinces concluded a peace, called the Pacification of Ghent, 1576, by which they pledged themselves to expel the Spanish troops, to defend their ancient privileges, and to guarantee to the southern provinces the full enjoyment of the Catholic faith. All the provinces, except Luxemburg, which had never taken part in the revolution, accepted the Pacification of Ghent and the Union of Brussels, 1577.

370. Don John of Austria, 1576-78. — Philip's half-brother, Don John of Austria, the victor of Lepanto, succeeded

Requesens in the government. He came with instructions to grant an unlimited pardon for the past, and to make peace with the Netherlands on any terms which left the Catholic religion and the sovereignty of the king intact. Yet he was received with suspicion by the southern provinces, and with hostility by William the Silent. Pending the negotiations with the States he remained in loyal Luxemburg. An understanding was finally reached between Don John and the States General in February, 1577. By the Perpetual Edict, Don John granted a general pardon, recognized the Pacification of Ghent and the Union of Brussels, and promised to remove the Spanish troops and set free all the political prisoners; while the States General promised fidelity to the Catholic religion, loyalty to the king of Spain, the giving up of foreign alliances, the disbanding of their own troops, and obedience to Don John and his successors as governors.

371. Fresh Disturbances. — But William the Silent did not want peace; he repudiated the pacification of Ghent, refused to restore the spoils taken from the Catholics, suppressed new monasteries and sent Calvinist preachers and political agitators into the Catholic provinces. Henceforth he sought his support amongst the lower population and the criminal classes of the cities. By unmerited reproaches, insults, calumnies and repeated attempts upon the freedom and the life of the governor, he secretly undermined and openly defied his authority so persistently that Don John, thoroughly alarmed for his personal safety, occupied with a band of followers the faithful city of Namur. This step roused a large part of the country, which feared a renewal of the war. William with his partisans hastened to Brussels. By his machination he prevented an amicable understanding which was on the point of being signed between the States General and Don John. The commune of Brussels and its demagogic committee of safety, the allies of Orange, sent a turbulent mob into the chambers, and forced the States to declare William governor of Brabant, although Brabant had no governor of its own, being ruled by the governor-general. To counteract his growing power, a number of prominent Catholics equally opposed to Philip II. and William the Silent, had called on archduke Mathias, the young brother of Emperor Rudolf II., to assume the government of

the provinces. The adroitness of William, however, enabled him to turn this move of his opponents to his own advantage. He supported the candidature. But to secure himself, he seized Ghent through the treachery of two leaders of the mob, who were noblemen in his pay, and whose whole life had been steeped in crime. When Mathias arrived, the States General, frightened by the reign of terror existing in Ghent, bestowed on him the shadowy title of Governor-General, but named William of Orange his substitute in Brabant, and his representative in the Netherlands. Thus Mathias became and remained a helpless tool in the hands of William the Silent.

The position of Don John was most trying. Since his conquest of Tunis Philip II. had conceived an unfounded jealousy and suspicion of his half-brother, which was studiously fostered by Antonio Perez, the king's confidant and evil genius. Don John had dispatched his enthusiastic friend and secretary, Escovedo, to Madrid, to impress on Philip the necessity of sending money and troops to the Netherlands, since Orange had succeeded in destroying the good effect of the Pacification of Ghent and the Perpetual Edict. Not only were the solicitations of Escovedo disregarded, and Don John left without a letter for three months, but Escovedo was assassinated by the orders of Perez. Perez was tried and exiled for the crime by Philip.

372. The Battle of Gembloux. — Meanwhile Don John obtained the long delayed permission to recall the Spanish troops from Italy. With the arrival of his nephew and friend Alexander Farnese, the son of Margaret of Parma, he received powerful reinforcements. A decisive battle between the army of the States and Don John was fought at Gembloux and won chiefly by the military skill of Alexander of Parma. Thirty standards, the entire artillery, nearly all the baggage, the commander-in-chief and several generals of the States fell into the hands of the Spaniards, January, 1578. The immediate result of this galling defeat was a revival of Calvinist fanaticism. The mob of Brussels called for the heads of the defeated officers. A general war against churches and monasteries, religious and priests, broke out wherever the Calvinists held sway. Ghent especially went through a reign of terror, sacrilege, murder, arson and rape. This fresh outbreak of the Calvinistic fury cleared the atmosphere. Every honest man began to see, that the question was no longer Spain or Netherlands, but Catholicism with Spain or Calvinism with William of Orange.

373. **Last Days of Don John.** — Pressed by enemies on all sides, doubted, almost abandoned by his brother, and weak in health, "Don John bore his trials with the firmest patience, fulfilling every duty, practicing every virtue, with a single eye to the glory of God, and the service of his ungrateful master." In his most worldly days he had preserved a chivalrous devotion to the Mother of God; he now resolved to retire to her holy mountain of Montserrat as soon as he should have saved Flanders. "In the meanwhile, he applied himself to expelling from his army the vices which had run riot under the duke of Alva and Requesens. Notwithstanding his stringent rule, he was ardently beloved by his soldiers who looked on him as their comrade and their friend. Don John's kindness to the sick during the plague imported from Lombardy knew no bounds. He tended them with his own hands and took infinite pains that no man should die without the sacraments; he constantly followed the holy viaticum to the hospital as a guard of honor. Everything he had was given in alms to the soldiers, and most of his time spent in providing for their needs." "On the 16th of September he sickened of malignant fever, caught from his plague-stricken soldiers." After a most touching letter written to his royal brother, the fever increased in violence and he hastened to receive the sacraments before delirium came on. He died full of contrition and resignation on the first of October, 1578. "Alexander of Parma, who was with him to the last, always spoke of his young uncle as having died the death of a Saint." He thus escaped the fate which Elisabeth of England had prepared for him by sending an agent (Ratcliff) to the Netherlands to murder him for his active sympathy with Mary Stuart. On his death-bed Don John had appointed Alexander Farnese as his successor, who was at once accepted by the army and confirmed by the king.

374. The Union of Utrecht, 1578. — Owing to the Calvinistic excesses, the middle and southern provinces were fast slipping from the hands of William the Silent. To reach the goal of his ambition, the sovereign crown of an independent count of Holland, a secession of the northern provinces from the common country became necessary. As representative of Mathias William could not personally move the matter; he did it through his brother John, stadtholder of Gelderland. The negotiations with the northern provinces began September 4. On December 6, 1578, the federal pact was signed in an inn of Utrecht. By this act the seven northern provinces, Gelderland, Holland, Zeeland, Utrecht and Friesland, soon after joined by Groeningen and Overyssel, as well as the towns of Ghent, Bruges, Ypres and Antwerp broke loose from the rest of the provinces, from the Pacification of Ghent and the Union of Brussels, and formed under William the Silent the Union of Utrecht. They annulled the clauses

of the earlier Union favorable to the Catholics. Calvinism became the state religion of the Union of Utrecht, although even now the Catholic inhabitants of these provinces formed a majority, 1578. The Union of Utrecht led to the Union of Arras and to the return of the ten southern provinces to the allegiance of Spain.

375. The Union of Arras. — Alexander Farnese soon proved that he was the right man in the right place. He was equally eminent as soldier and general, as governor and statesman. Whilst he was animated by a fixed resolution to save the remaining provinces for the king, he won the minds of the wavering by his conciliatory manner, by his justice and patience. Philip gave him ample powers to forgive the past and to deal with the provinces at his own discretion, if only the sovereignty of Spain and the Catholic religion were upheld. The irreconcilable policy of the Calvinists drove the Walloon provinces into the arms of Alexander. Besides, the duke of Anjou, on whom they had set their hopes, had deceived them by intriguing for his own interests with the States General and William the Silent. Turbulent Ghent threatened their churches. The Calvinist hordes of John Casimir, 30,000 "German devils" joining the troops of the States after the battle of Gemblours, raised a cry of horror wherever they set their foot. Then came the news of the contemplated secession. Under these circumstances the Walloon provinces became convinced that the Catholic religion could be preserved only by submission to Philip. They made a last appeal to the States for the general enforcement of the Pacification of Ghent and the Union of Brussels. Receiving no satisfaction, the provinces of Artois, Hainault, and the towns of Lille, Douay, and Orchies in French Flanders formed the Union of Arras, January 6, 1579. The Union of Arras was their answer to the Union of Utrecht. May 17 they concluded peace with Alexander Farnese and submitted to the king. They received a general pardon for the past, the guarantee of the undisturbed exercise of the Catholic faith, and of the enjoyment of all their ancient privileges. The following year the third party, the Catholic malcontents who had called archduke Mathias into the country, submitted to Philip and joined their forces to those of Alexander of Parma. The conquest of Maestricht in 1579 gave the governor-general a secure position in the south.

376. William's Treaty with the Duke of Anjou, 1583. — In 1580 Philip II. placed the ban of the empire on his perjured vassal, William of Orange. To maintain himself, William had to seek for foreign aid. At his instigation the revolted states for the second time concluded a treaty with Francis, duke of Anjou, by which they conferred on him the sovereignty over all the provinces. By a separate treaty between William the Silent and the duke of Anjou, — unknown to the rest of the agents, — Anjou in his new capacity ceded Holland, Zeeland and Utrecht to William, 1581. The ceded states conferred sovereign power, for the time of the war, on William (July, 1581). All the provinces, which had not yet made terms with the prince of Parma, solemnly abjured their allegiance to Philip II., but voted against declaring him the enemy of the country because they had a rich merchant fleet on its way to Spain. The consequence of the step was a persecution of the Catholics within the Union of Utrecht, which surpassed all the previous ones. Archduke Mathias, who had been of no use to any party, was dismissed with thanks. The duke of Anjou was unable to gain the confidence even of the party that called him. He left the country in 1583 after losing 2,000 men in a vain attempt to seize Antwerp.

377. The United Provinces. — William the Silent was on the point of being recognized as sovereign count of Holland, when he was struck down by the bullet of Balthasar Gerard, a fanatical Burgundian, July 10, 1584. The States General of the seven United Provinces acknowledged his son Maurice as leader, but limited his powers. The United Provinces gradually worked out a republican form of government, and grew into a powerful commercial state. Supported by France and England they baffled all the efforts of Philip II. and his successors to reconquer them. Their independence was recognized in the Peace of Westphalia, 1648.

378. The Spanish Netherlands. — Alexander continued his successful career as statesman and general. The people now not only allowed but asked him to employ Spanish troops. In 1584, Groeningen, Bruges and Ghent capitulated. The following year he conquered Brussels, Mechlin and Antwerp, and many other

places, and thus saved the ten southern provinces to Spain. The richer Calvinists emigrated from the recovered cities to the United Provinces, and the Jesuits completed the return of the people to the Catholic Church. Like Don John, Alexander was rewarded for his glorious career with the inevitable suspicions and neglect of Philip II. and ordered to march repeatedly into France to aid the duke of Mayenne. Alexander of Parma, the first soldier of his period, and one of the most devoted servants of Philip II., passed away at Arras, December, 1592, at the age of forty-seven. The consequence of the king's policy was, that Maurice by 1594 had conquered nearly all the strongholds of Gelderland, Overyssel and Groeningen hitherto held by the Spaniards. In 1598 after an interregnum of incapable provisional governors, Philip II. separated the Netherlands from Spain and gave them as a dowry to his daughter Clara Eugenia Isabella and her husband, archduke Albert, to be jointly ruled by them. It was, however, stipulated, that these provinces should return to Spain, if the "archdukes" should die without issue. Their mild and beneficent rule restored contentment and prosperity in the Spanish Netherlands, and led to a period of brilliant success in art, literature and industrial and agricultural progress.

Holzwarth: *Abfall*, vol. 3, pp. 163-507 (numerous sources in Holzwarth). — Zum Abfall: St., vol. 1, p. 428. — Stirling Maxwell: *Don John of Austria.* — Bruslé de Montpleinchamp: *Vie de D. Juan d'Autriche.* — *Don John of Austria:* D. R. '81, 1, p. 1; E. R. '83, 3, p. 1. — A. Mignet: *Antonio Perez et Philippe II.* — William of Orange: "*Apologie*" (contains many misstatements and slanders). — Gachard: *Corresp. de Guillaume le Taciturne, prince d'Orange.* — Groen van Prinsterer: *Archives ou Corresp. inédite de la Maison d'Orange-Nassau.* — *Was William the Silent a Hero?* M. '97, 1, p. 507. — *Alexander Farnese:* D. R. '84, 1, p. 81. — A. M. Grange: *The Archduchess Isabel:* D. R. '86, 2, p. 260. — Motley: *Rise; The History of the United Netherlands, 1584-1609.* — Lingard, vol. 7 and 8: Elisabeth. — M. Creighton: *The Age of Elisabeth*, Books 5 and 6. — G. E. Thorold: *The Story of Holland.* — W. C. Robinson: *Penal Times in Holland* (after union of Utrecht).

§ 6.

MARY STUART, QUEEN OF SCOTS — 1542-87 — MARY IN SCOTLAND, 1561-67.

379. Beginning of Her Reign. — Mary Stuart, widow at eighteen by the death of Francis II. of France, returned to Scotland in 1561, safely escaping the English cruisers sent to intercept her.

Passage through England was denied her, because she refused to sign the Treaty of Edinburgh (no. 286) and to acknowledge Elisabeth as queen of England. As the daughter of Anne Boleyn, Elisabeth had, in the eyes of the Church, no lawful claim to the crown, which, on the death of Mary the Catholic, would have devolved on Mary Stuart.


Mary's Claim.
HENRY VII.
JAMES IV. of Scotland. m. MARGARET m. Archibald, Earl of Angus.
Henry VIII
Mary of Guise m. JAMES V.
Margaret m. Matthew Stuart, Earl of Lenox.
Francis II. of France. m. MARY Q. OF SCOTS. m. Henry Darnley.
JAMES VI. of Scotland.
JAMES I., of England.

This position of the two queens is the keynote to their subsequent relations. Mary undertook the government of her turbulent heritage under the guidance of her half-brother, Lord James Stuart, her evil genius, who was created earl of Moray (1562). With great difficulty she obtained toleration of Catholic worship for her own household, but could not prevent the imprisonment and cruel treatment of the Catholic prelates for the crime of saying Mass (1563).

380. Mary Marries Darnley; Revolt of the Nobles. — In 1565 Mary married her Catholic cousin, Darnley, son of the earl of Lenox, and had him proclaimed king of Scots. To disarm the Protestant opponents of the marriage, Mary, by proclamation, granted freedom of conscience to all her subjects, only demanding from the Protestant Assembly the same freedom for Catholics as she had granted to them. Nevertheless, the marriage was made a pretext by the disaffected nobles, headed by the earl of Moray, to form a conspiracy against their sovereign, under the promised protection of queen Elisabeth. The plotters rose in arms, but the majority of the nation remained faithful to their queen. Mary appeared in person at the head of the troops, and the insurgents were forced to disperse, 1565. Moray and other leaders fled across the English border.

381. The Murder of Rizzio, 1566. — Darnley soon proved a bad husband. He was unkind and brutal, a drunkard and profligate, and fond of low company. Politically he became for the queen a source of daily anxiety, weakness and danger. The queen's enemies roused his ambition to demand from her the crown matrimonial which would have given him royalty for life. Mary's refusal to grant this crown and to pardon the exiled lords was ascribed to Rizzio, the queen's foreign secretary, who was also suspected of planning a restoration of the Catholic religion. A new plot was hatched with Elisabeth's knowledge. Moray was the first to sign the bond for the murder of Rizzio. The earl of Morton, the most powerful member of the House of Douglas, was a chief conspirator. Darnley himself joined the conspiracy. As on similar occasions, John Knox thundered against the "idolatrous" Catholics and prophesied that God's punishment would fall on Rizzio. On March 9, three days before the date fixed for the trial of Moray and his associates, Rizzio was ruthlessly butchered under the superintendence of Morton and in the presence of Mary and Darnley, and Mary herself imprisoned in her palace. Moray returned at once to Scotland.

382. Mary's Temporary Triumph. — The next move of the plotters was to depose Mary and imprison her for life. For the present it was resolved that at her first attempt to escape she should be cut to pieces. The queen, however, succeeded in stirring the conscience of her husband, and with his assistance she fled to the castle of Dunbar, where she summoned her faithful subjects around her standard, and issued a writ of treason against the plotters. At the head of 8,000 men she returned to Edinburgh, while the conspirators fled to England or the west of Scotland.

John Knox, faithful to his instinct of self-preservation, sought safety in flight, nor did he dare return to Edinburgh till after Mary's dethronement.

383. The Conferences at Craigmillar. — In her wise and generous attempt to promote peace and union, Mary again trusted her half-brother, and pardoned Rizzio's murderers at the instance of the earls of Moray and Bothwell, thus opening the door to the third

conspiracy of the Protestant nobles within her reign. The earl of Morton, however, and his friends were excluded from the pardon, because Darnley was resolutely opposed to his recall.

The conspirators first asked the queen to pardon Morton and his companions in exile, in which case they would find means to obtain a divorce between her and her husband. The queen, on reflection, positively refused to entertain the project of divorce. Thereupon the plotters, in accordance with the savage customs of the age, signed bonds for the removal of Darnley. It is certain that Moray was present at these Conferences of Craigmillar; it was he who opened the question to his confederates. The pardon of the earl of Morton and most of his friends was granted by Mary on the occasion of the solemn baptism of prince James (afterwards king of Scotland and England), when the queen could not well refuse the solicitations of the French ambassador, the Scotch nobles and especially the queen of England. The prince's baptism was the last public ceremony of the Catholic Church in Scotland.

384. Henry Darnley's Murder, 1567, and its Consequences. — Darnley, in the meantime, was as unmanageable after saving the queen as he had been before, and for a considerable time separated himself from her presence. At Glasgow he fell sick with the small-pox, and was promptly visited by his wife. Under the influence of his sickness he confessed his faults and promised amendment, in proof of which change he determined to return with her to Edinburgh. The reconciliation between the husband and wife appeared to be complete. While the queen with the prince went to reside at Holyrood palace, where the infectious nature of Darnley's disease made it impossible that he should accompany her, the conspirators induced the unsuspecting queen to lodge him in the ill-omened Kirk of Field, in the neighborhood of Edinburgh (Dec. 31, 1566). The earl of Moray after having carefully planned each successive step in the development of the conspiracy which was to consign his sister to a perpetual imprisonment or an early grave, left Edinburgh on the eve of Darnley's murder, and soon after went to France, leaving the execution of the further plans to his associates. On the 10th of February Kirk of Field was destroyed by the explosion of gunpowder placed in a mine driven under the house. Darnley's body was found in the orchard, some distance from the ruins; he was probably strangled while trying to escape. The unfortunate queen was deeply grieved and terrified.

According to Nau, Mary's secretary (Memorials of Mary's Reign), the murder was planned "by the earls of Bothwell and Morton and James of Balfour, whose complicity in the crime was established by a bond, signed by the earls of Moray, Huntly, Bothwell, Morton, and others. The murderers pretended that in putting the king to death they were acting for the public good, and that their object was to free the queen from the bondage in which she was held by her husband. The actual murderers were the persons who afterwards were the loudest in demanding an investigation, and the most active in endeavoring to throw the guilt upon her majesty, the queen of Scotland" (Stevenson: Nau).

The earl of Bothwell, accused by Darnley's father, Lenox, and by anonymous placards, was arraigned at the Tollbooth (Parliamentary building of Edinburgh), and publicly acquitted by judges who were his accomplices in the crime. The Parliament, meeting immediately after, confirmed the acquittal.

385. Mary's Forced Union with Bothwell, 1567.—The next step in the plan to ruin the queen was to provide her with a husband, and that husband was to be Bothwell, the murderer of Darnley. On the evening of the day on which Parliament rose (April 19), the guilty lords, who had signed the Craigmillar bond, held a meeting in the tavern of one Ainslie, and signed a bond, in which they reaffirmed Bothwell's innocence and recommended him as a fitting husband to the queen. Accordingly the members of the Privy Council represented to her the disorganized state of the realm and urged her to marry Bothwell whom all the nobles would obey. Mary was shocked by the proposal and at once gave an absolute refusal. The lords of the Congregation were not easily discouraged. A fresh deputation assailed her. Once more the queen rejected their proposal purely and simply. They answered to her objections, that the highest authority in the realm had acquitted Bothwell, that he was already divorced, or on the point of being divorced. The lords of the Congregation with eight bishops signed a similar declaration and recommended Bothwell as the fittest husband. Mary had no one to whom she could turn for advice or protection. She was rather commanded than consulted by the rebellious lords. While she waited, and hesitated and deliberated, Bothwell, at the head of 1,000 horse, took violent possession of her person, while she was traveling to Edin-

burgh, and carried her off into the castle of Dunbar, where he separated her from her friends and detained her for nearly a week. Fear, force, and if we may believe Bothwell's own confession in his will, narcotic means did the rest. Conveyed to Edinburgh as a close prisoner, she had to submit to the Protestant marriage rite. May 15, 1567.

386. Carberry Hill.— No sooner had Bothwell accomplished his crime, than the scene changed as if by magic. The plotters who had signed the Craigmillar and Ainslie bonds and urged the queen to marry Bothwell, now turned against him, and charged him with the murder of Darnley and the treasonable seizure and marriage of the queen, signed bonds at Stirling, and armed. The opposing forces met at Carberry Hill. Here Mary surrendered to the lords upon their assurance that they would acknowledge her as their sovereign. But whilst Bothwell was allowed to depart unharmed, Mary Stuart was at once treated as a captive, loaded with brutal indignities, and imprisoned in the fortress of Lochleven under the harsh custody of Lady Douglas, Moray's mother. Here Mary, threatened by the rebel lords with instant death, resigned the crown in favor of her infant son, James VI., and appointed the earl of Moray regent during James' minority, all under protest.

Bothwell was subsequently impeached, fled to Norway, became a pirate, and was kept prisoner by Frederic II. of Denmark, till his death, 1578. He left a written confession which establishes Mary's innocence of Darnley's death.

387. Battle of Langside, 1568. — In May, 1568, Mary escaped from her prison, and was joined by a great number of loyal adherents. But before her friends from the north and south could join forces, Moray, now acting as regent, defeated the royal party at Langside near Glasgow, May 13. Mary, notwithstanding the most earnest opposition of her loyal followers, resolved to seek refuge in England. On May 15 she wrote the fatal letter to Elisabeth: "I am now forced out of my kingdom and driven to such straits that next to God I have no hope but in your goodness." On May 16 she crossed the border, and May 19 the first orders of

Elisabeth arrived in Cumberland which made Mary queen of Scots, the prisoner of the English queen for nineteen years.

Rev. Jos. Stevenson, S. J.: *Mary Stuart, a Narrative of the First 18 Years of her Life, principally from Original Documents.*— Claude Nau: *The Hist. of Mary Stuart from the Murder of Rizzio until her flight into England*, Ed. by J. Stevenson.— John Hosack: *Mary Queen of Scots and Her Accusers.*—John Stuart: *Mary, Queen of Scots; a Lost Chapter in her History Recovered (notices of Earl of Bothwell, Lady Jane Gordon, Bothwell's divorce, etc.).*— James F. Meline: *Mary Queen of Scots and her latest Engl. Historian* (Froude). — Prince Alexander Labanoff: *Lettres, Instructions et Mémoires de Marie Stuart.*— L. Wiesener: *Hist. de Marie Stuart (Mary St. and Bothwell).*— A. M'Neel Caird: *Mary Stuart, her Guilt or Innocence.— Other Lives of Mary Stuart*, by Hon. Mrs. Maxwell-Scott; G. Chalmers; Brownson (last series 13); Agnes M. Stewart; Th. Opitz; Prof. Petit-Ch. Flandre; J. Gauthier.— Hon. Col. Lindsay: *Mary Queen of Scots and her Marriage with Bothwell* (Compare H. P.-B., vol. 6, p. 153).— Jos. Stevenson: *Mary Stuart, Q. of Scotland, and Claude Nau:* M. '79, 1, pp. 404, 532, 2; pp. 87, 185, 328, 483.— J. H. Pollen: *Mary Stuart and Recent Research.*— G. M. Dreves: *Bischof Leslie über Maria Stuart, Moray und Bothwell*, St. v. 29, p. 151; also v. 19, p. 83.— Bellesheim-Blair: *Hist. of the Catholic Church in Scotland, vol. 3, 1560-1625.*— Forbes-Leith, S. J.: *Narratives of Scottish Catholics under Mary Stuart and James VI.* — R. H. Story: *The Church of Scotland Past and Present.*— M. D. Conway: *The Story of a Scottish Martyr (State of the Church in Scotland, 1580-1615)*: M. '78, 1, pp. 171, 337.

§ 7.

MARY STUART AND ELISABETH.

388. The Conferences of York and Westminster. — Mary Stuart, finding herself in Elisabeth's power, demanded either to be restored to her royal position in Scotland, or to be allowed free passage to France, and asked for a personal interview with Elisabeth. The English queen denied all her requests until Mary would have cleared away the suspicions concerning her husband's death. Conscious of her innocence, Mary accepted the proposal of a conference for the settlement of her case, and by her own command disarmed a host of nearly 10,000 men who had risen in her favor in Scotland. The conferences were held first at York and later at Westminster between commissioners appointed by Mary Stuart, queen Elisabeth, and regent Moray, under the presidency of Howard, duke of Norfolk. The result was a verdict of non-committal.

The conference was a judicial farce from the beginning to the end. Moray laid a mass of forgeries before the commissioners. Mary Stuart was, throughout the proceedings, denied the privilege enjoyed even by the lowest criminal, of being confronted with the proofs of her supposed guilt. The

proceedings made the impression on the earl of Sussex, that "Mary's proofs will judicially fall best out, as it is thought." At the close of the conference, Cecil, Elisabeth's leading statesman, announced in the queen's name: "that there had been nothing sufficient produced by Moray and his friends, whereby the queen of England should conceive or take any evil opinion of the queen, her good sister." On the other hand, Elisabeth was "equally convinced of the unimpaired honor and allegiance of Moray himself" and his adherents. This sentence of Elisabeth is "perhaps the most absurd judicial opinion ever left on record." (Tytler.)

389. A New Pilgrimage of Grace, 1569. — Mary's refusal to abdicate the crown of Scotland sealed her fate; she remained the prisoner of Elisabeth who for ten years had been busy undermining her throne. The same period of penal persecution in England had made the Catholics look upon Mary Stuart as the chief hope of their religion in England. In the north, where the old faith and the old nobility were strongest, the Catholic earls of Westmoreland and Northumbria and the Protestant duke of Norfolk declared in her favor. The Catholic religion was to be restored; Cecil to be driven from power, Elisabeth to acknowledge Mary as her heir and successor, the duke of Norfolk to marry the Stuart queen. Elisabeth suspected Norfolk and sent him to the Tower. The northern earls invited to court, a summons which meant the block, unfurled the standard of the Five Wounds and marched to Durham, where to the joy of thousands the Holy Sacrifice was again celebrated in the cathedral. At the head of 17,000 cavalry and 4,000 foot they marched south everywhere restoring the Catholic worship. But in the middle and southern counties the Catholics were not ready to join the pilgrims, and the promised succor of the duke of Alva from the Netherlands failed. Thus the rising was put down by a Puritan army levied in the south by the earl of Sussex. Elisabeth's vengeance was terrible. Martial law was proclaimed in Northumberland, Durham and Yorkshire; 900 of the poorer classes were executed in a summary way. The higher classes were tried for high treason. If the local courts condemned them, all well, if not, they were sent to London and tried by the Star Chamber. The earl of Sussex complained that he had nothing to do in the north "but to direct hanging matter." The earl of Westmoreland escaped to

Flanders. Northumberland died a martyr to his faith in 1572. In view of the fact that Elisabeth fought the Catholic faith in every country, dragged a Catholic sovereign from prison to prison against the law of nations, and butchered her Catholic subjects in the north, Pius V. excommunicated her, and absolved her subjects from the oath of allegiance, 1570.

In Scotland Moray, alarmed at the growing sympathy for Mary Stuart, had been negotiating with Elisabeth to get his sister into his power, when the bullet of an assassin whose estate he had unjustly confiscated ended his treacherous career, 1570.

390. The Ridolfi Plot. — A new plan of a Catholic rising combined with a Spanish invasion was discussed between the English Catholic gentry, Pius V., Philip II. and Alva. The object of the invasion was to free Mary Stuart, raise her to the throne and marry her to the duke of Norfolk. A scheme of assassinating Elisabeth was suggested to Philip and Alva. Pius V. was purposely kept in ignorance of this part of the plan and Philip himself withdrew from it. The Pope, however, considered an open invasion of England as perfectly lawful. Ridolfi, a Florentine merchant residing in London, acted as agent between the English Catholics, comprising a great number of noble names, and the Powers on the Continent. The talkative Ridolfi was no match for the watchfulness of William Cecil, now Lord Burleigh. The plot was discovered, the Spanish ambassador driven from England, and the duke of Norfolk tried and sent to the block, 1572.

391. Persecution and Heroism. — The Bull of Pius V. was the signal for war to the knife against the Catholic Church. The Parliament of 1571 passed penal laws which made it death to introduce into the country any papal bull or writ, to absolve or reconcile with the Church any person or to be absolved or reconciled, or to call the queen a heretic. The Parliament of 1581 increased the rigors of these laws, imposed a fine of 200 marks and a year's imprisonment for saying mass, a fine of 100 marks and a year of imprisonment for hearing it; a fine of 20*l.* a month for absence from the Anglican service, and the penalty of high treason for absolution given or received. The Parliament of 1585 enacted the law that any Jesuit, seminary priest or other, remaining in England over forty days, or any English subject studying at a foreign

seminary, and not returning home within 60 days to take the oath of supremacy should suffer the penalty of high treason, *i. e.*, be hanged, drawn and quartered alive. The cause of these laws was the widespread renewal of religious life and zeal among the English Catholics fostered by the new missionaries. In 1568 William, later Cardinal Allen, a prelate of apostolic piety and earnestness, who trained many a martyr on the English battlefield, had founded the English College in Douay, which in 1578 was transferred for a time to Rheims. In Rome Gregory XIII. had founded the English College and placed it under the care of the Jesuits. The zeal of Father Parsons added the English Seminary at Valladolid in 1589 and that of St. Omer in 1593. Till 1573 the Pilgrimage of Grace served as a pretext for the persecution of Catholics. From that year onward the Catholic faith alone was the crime, apostasy the one thing demanded of them.

The terrible domiciliary visits which Catholics had to expect at every hour of the day or the night began in 1574, the year in which the first missionaries arrived from Douay. In the next five years Allen sent nearly a hundred missionaries to England. They were followed in 1580 by the Jesuit mission, in charge of Father Parsons, Campian, Cottam, and others, and a band of devoted missionary priests from Rheims. Benedictines and Franciscans also took their lives into their own hands in their apostolic zeal. Most of them became glorious martyrs or confessors, after wandering from hiding-place to hiding-place, to strengthen the Catholics in their faith.

Before the year 1588 twelve hundred Catholics had lost life, property or liberty. From the defeat of the Armada till the queen's death, the Catholics groaned under the pressure of incessant persecution, notwithstanding the patriotism with which numerous Catholic gentlemen had taken her side against Philip.

In the last twenty years of Elisabeth's reign 142 priests were put to death, 90 more died in prison, while 62 distinguished laymen suffered martyrdom. Hundreds of the Catholic gentry and thousands of the lower classes were fined into poverty, imprisoned, whipped or had their ears pierced with hot irons for conscience' sake. The Tower had five different sorts of torture for priests or laymen who refused to indicate the hiding-places of priests.

They were the rack; the "Scavenger's daughter," a broad hoop of iron, into which the prisoner was pressed till the blood flowed from nose and mouth; the iron gauntlet, by which the prisoner was suspended in the air from two distant points of a beam; "Little Ease," a cell so narrow that the prisoner could neither walk, stand, lie or sit; the "Pit," a dungeon 20 feet below the surface without air or light.*

The noble confessor, Francis Tregian, the host of Cuthbert Maine, the proto-martyr of Douay, suffered twenty-eight years of imprisonment for the faith. His first trouble arose from resisting the immoral advances of the "virgin-queen." The saintly Margaret Clitheroe, "the Pearl of York," was laid on a sharp stone and pressed to death by heavy weights. To the priest-hunter, Topcliffe, assisted by a horde of spies and pursuivants, even the Tower instruments were too mild; he would take his victims under the warrant of the privy council to his own house in order to superintend their suffering. One of his noblest victims, the gentle poet Southwell, S. J., was made to suffer torture worse than death, before he was moved for thirty months to the Tower, to be finally hanged, disemboweled and quartered in 1595. His friend the earl of Arundel and Surrey, whose widow had harbored Father Southwell, succumbed a few months later, after an imprisonment of ten years. But even in their prisons the missionaries found great scope for their zeal and effected numerous conversions. Still more insidious, and to a measure successful, were the queen's intrigues carried out through her secretaries, to sow dissensions between the regular and secular priests and to carry them into the very homes of the English Catholics.

392. The Walsingham Conspiracy. — Elisabeth could not enjoy her throne in peace as long as Mary Stuart, whom a great number of Englishmen considered the lawful heir to the throne, was among the living. Walsingham, the queen's chief secretary, and his associates, Burleigh and Leicester, undertook to accomplish Mary Stuart's destruction.

The problem was to implicate Mary in a plot directed against Elisabeth's life, to serve as a pretext for Mary's execution. A complete system of secret communication between the imprisoned queen and the outside world was organized by Walsingham. Walsingham's paid agents, through recommendations fraudulently obtained, insinuated themselves into Mary's confidence, who gradually came to regard them as her most devoted adherents.

* The Tower officials of to-day point to these instruments as those used by the Spanish Inquisition.

The prime mover in the plot was Gilbert Gifford, an ecclesiastic of a Catholic family, who had received Holy Orders up to the deaconship (1585) for the purpose of gaining free access to the Catholic circles in England and on the continent as Walsingham's spy. (Moray's Letter Books of Sir Amias Poulet, p. 337). In the role of an accredited confidant of Mary Stuart, the English Catholics, the Guises, the French and Spanish ambassadors, the Archbishop of Glasgow, etc., he superintended the secret correspondence between Mary Stuart and her friends, and traveled alternately in England and France. It was he who suggested Elisabeth's murder to the Spanish ambassador long before the so-called Babington Conspiracy was matured. Other instruments of Walsingham were Sir Amias Poulet, a rude and fanatical Puritan, Mary's keeper at Chartley Castle, who had to send the Queen's letters to Walsingham; Philippes, Walsingham's professional forger, who had to "decipher" Mary's letters; Gregory, an expert in opening and resealing letters; and "the honest man" a brewer of Burton, who had to convey Mary's private correspondence to and from Chartley Castle.

393. **Mary Stuart's Position.** — Mary was now completely in the hands of her enemies, broken in health, insulted and ill-treated by Poulet, and gradually deprived of her trustiest servants. Even her son James, now acting as king of Scotland, who for a time had interested himself in the fate of his mother, abandoned her cause. In the spring of 1585, he made a bargain with Elisabeth to leave his mother to her tender mercies for the bribe of a dozen bloodhounds, an annual pension of £5,000 and some vague promises of the English succession.

394. **Babington.** — The chain of treachery around the unfortunate queen was complete before the first sign of the so-called Babington Conspiracy showed itself. Anthony Babington was a young and enthusiastic admirer of Mary Stuart. In the general scheme including the liberation of Mary, a Spanish invasion, and a rising of the Catholics in the north, Babington with five associates (the six gentlemen) planned the deliverance of Mary. Of the six gentlemen two were from the very beginning of the plot Walsingham's agents. Gilbert Gifford was the real director of the plot, and suggested to Babington to make Elisabeth's assassination part of his scheme.

The letter of Babington to Mary, which unfolds the different schemes in her favor, reached the imprisoned queen July 12th, 1586, by the secret channel of communication. This letter had been intercepted by Gifford, opened by Gregory, handled by Philippes, and went straight from Walsingham to Mary Stuart. On the 17th, Mary wrote her answer, an elaborate instruction, how an insurrection might

be organized and war made upon the queen of England. As an independent sovereign detained against her will and in violation of the law of nations, Mary had a right to issue such instructions. These instructions would not have sufficed to condemn Mary and to justify before the European courts the execution of a sovereign queen. Therefore Walsingham and his tools inserted a clause, in which Mary Stuart is made to approve the assassination of Elisabeth. Part of the letter still preserved shows an erasure and the incriminating sentence written on the erasure. The falsification was so clumsy, that it defeated its object. For Mary is made to say in substance: Do not move in the matter of my delivery, *until Elisabeth is dead*, and after her death *so manage* my escape, that Elisabeth may not be able to take me again and shut me up in some inaccessible dungeon, or failing in this persecute my friends.

395. Mary's Execution. — Babington and his companions were executed, 1586. Mary Stuart was tried in Fotheringay, in October, on the charge of conspiracy against Elisabeth's life. Barefaced forgeries of Babington's letter and her own reply were used, but Mary solemnly denied having either received or written any such words as were brought in evidence against her. Not a witness, not one original document was produced in support of the charge. This mockery of justice ended in her condemnation. The next few months Elisabeth was employed in devising plans for causing her victim to be murdered in order to avoid the odium of being herself the murderer. Both the keepers, Sir Poulet and Sir Drury, refused compliance with Elisabeth's diabolical suggestion that they should privately assassinate the prisoner. Elisabeth often lamented "that among the thousands who professed to be attached to her as their sovereign, not one would spare her the necessity of dipping her hands in the blood of a sister queen." Elisabeth finally signed the death warrant. The execution took place February 8, 1587. The external consolations of religion were denied her. Mary was guilty of no other crime than that of being a Catholic, and lawful heir to the crown of England. Her constancy in her faith was the chief cause of her death. The earl of Kent, after delivering the death warrant, told her: "Madam, your life would have been the death

of our new religion, while your death — God grant it — will be its life."

Wiesener-Yonge: *The Youth of Queen Elisabeth* (1533-1558); also: M, vol. 17, p. 428 — A. Strickland: *Elisabeth*, vol. 3. — J. M. Stone: *Progress of the Persecution under Elisabeth:* D. R. '91, 4, p. 311. — Spillmann, S. J.: *Die Engl. Martyrer unter Elisabeth.* — D. J. Morris: *The Deposed Bishops of England:* M. '89, 3, 346; *The Catholics of York under Elisabeth; The Troubles of our Cath. Forefathers;* see also M. '75, 2, p. 235. — *Die Katholiken in Yorkshire under Elis.:* H P. B., vol. 80, p. 218. — Knox: *Records of the Engl. Catholics under the Penal Laws; Days of Persecution:* M., vol. 5, pp. 338, 559; vol. 7, p. 451; vol. 8, pp. 67, 194, 502; vol. 9, pp. 71, 363, 509, 603.

F. G. Lee: *The Church under Queen Elisabeth. — Kirchenpolitik der Königin Elisabeth*, 1550-64: H. P. B, v. 124, p. 307. — *Pius V. and the Ridolfi Plot:* D. R. '75, 1, pp. 130-143. — *The Mission of Ridolfi:* M '75, 1, pp. 203, 333.

Dr. A. Bellesheim: *Wilhelm Cardinal Allen und die Engl. Seminare auf dem Festlande.* — T. F. Knox: *The First and Second Diaries of the Engl. College of Douay; Letters and Memorials of W. Card. Allen* (1532-1594). — J. Thompson: *Card. Allen:* M. '78, 2, p. 369; *Katholik:* 85, 2, p. 28.

Pollen: *Acts of the English Martyrs.* — Richard Simpson: *Edmund Campian.* — J. Morris: *Bl. E. Campian and his "Ten Reasons;" Bl. Edm. Campian and his Companions.* — F. Goldie, S. J.: *Bl. Edm. Campian:* C. T. S. P., vol. 9. — J. G. MacLeod: *Robert Southwell, Scholar, Poet and Martyr:* M. '77, 3, p. 439. — Th F. Knox: *Thos. Goldwell, Bish. of Asaph, the Last Survivor of the Ancient Engl. Hierarchy:* M. '96, 1, pp. 53, 129. — G. A. Lee: *Ven. Phil. Howard, Earl of Arundel:* C. T. S. P., v. 3. — A. Jessopp: *One Generation of a Norfolk House;* see also J. Morris: *Dr. Jessopp's Henry Walpole:* M. '78, 5, p. 323. — J. R. Willington, M. A.: *An Engl. Manor House in the Days of Queen Elisabeth.* — Thos. Gibson: *Lydiate Hall and its Associations.* — W. S. Lilly: *The Penal Laws* (under Henry VIII. and Elisabeth): D. R. '91, 3, p. 1. — J. Morris: *Jesuits and Seculars in the Reign of Elisabeth:* M. '90, 2, p. 243. — Kobler: *Die Martyrer Englands in 16ten und 17ten Jahrh.:* I. K. Z.: '84, 1, p. 241. — Jos. Gillow: *Bibliogr. Dictionary of the Engl. Catholics.*

John Morris, S. J.: *The Letter Books of Sir Amias Poulet, Keeper of Mary Queen of Scots.* — R. M. Chantelauze: *Marie Stuart, d'après le Journal inédit de Bourgoing* — Parkinson: *Amias, Poulet and Mary Q. of Scots:* M., vol. 21, pp. 87, 216. — Hon. Mrs. Maxwell-Scott: *The Tragedy of Fotheringay.* — G. Scott: *The Memoirs of James Melvil* (1549-1593). — *Babington Conspiracy:* D. R '84, 4, p. 336. — *Acts of the Parliament of Scotland, Histories and Church Hist. of Scotland*

§ 8.

PHILIP II. AND ELISABETH.

396. Causes of Philip's Resentment. — In the beginning of Elisabeth's reign Philip II. supported her cause, being jealous of the power of France. The marriage of Francis the dauphin with Mary Stuart, who was actually queen of Scotland and claimed the English succession, seemed to unite three crowns on the head of a French king. But Elisabeth's constant meddling in Scottish affairs, her secret and open support of the rebels in the Netherlands, her seizing the money destined for Alva, roused Philip's suspicion and resentment. English merchant sailors claimed the right of trading in the West Indian Colonies, and when the claim was denied by the Spanish authorities, they resorted to private war and piracy, took Spanish ships, levied contributions in the Spanish settlements and burnt Spanish towns without

any declaration of war. Foremost among these rovers was Francis Drake, first a slave trader, then a corsair. He raided the islands and coasts of the West Indies as far as Panama, where he discovered the Pacific, 1572, heretofore known only to the Spaniards; 1579–80 Drake passed through the straits of Magellan up the Pacific coast and returned by way of the Cape of Good Hope, the first to sail around the globe. In his plundering raids he everywhere seized the treasures of Philip and his subjects, while Elisabeth ridiculed the demands of the Spanish king for satisfaction. That open war between the two countries was delayed so long was due to Philip's indecision and his distrust of France. Since 1585, however, there was actual war between Philip and Elisabeth in the Netherlands, whither she had sent the earl of Leicester with 6,000 men.

397. The Spanish Armada, 1588. — The execution of Mary Stuart filled the cup of Philip's resentment. Too slow to save her, he undertook to avenge her death and to claim England for himself as a descendant of John of Gaunt. Admiral Santa Cruz demanded 556 vessels and 80,000 men for the expedition against England. The demand was far too high for Philip, and the admiral was ordered to avail himself of the Spanish forces in the Netherlands. The death of Santa Cruz in January, 1588, was an irreparable loss to Spain. The duke of Medina Sidonia, who was appointed in his place, was neither a sailor nor a soldier. His fleet, when entering the Channel, before Alexander Farnese was ready to co-operate with him, numbered about 120 vessels carrying 24,000 men. The English under admiral Howard of Effingham had 197 vessels, smaller indeed, than the Spanish ships, but faster and better manned and armed. The English Catholics, who might have fought with Philip for Mary Stuart, now generally took Elisabeth's side against the foreign invader. Howard followed the Spanish fleet up the Channel, and kept up a running fight with the rear squadron. Fire ships dislodged the Spaniards from the port and roadstead of Calais. In the principal engagement, off Gravelines, the Spanish ships suffered considerably from the English guns. But the greatest havoc was wrought by a furious tempest, which drove pursuers and pursued past the coast of Flanders and scattered both fleets. Only fifty-three Spanish ships found their way home round the north of Scotland and the west of Ireland.

In 1589 a fleet of 50 vessels and 15,000 men under Sir John Norris and Francis Drake landed at Corunna, destroyed the shipping and repulsed a

Spanish army. Reinforced by the earl of Essex they made an attempt on Lisbon, failing in which they plundered 60 vessels belonging to the Hansa towns and returned home.

398. Philip's Last Contests and Death — Philip's last partial success was the capture of Calais in 1596 where he once more gathered a fleet for an English invasion. Elisabeth, however, anticipated him. An English and Dutch fleet under Howard and Essex landed in Spain, took and sacked Cadiz, destroying its shipping, and sailed away with its treasures.

Philip's lack of financial system, his wars, the loss of his resources from the Netherlands, and English piracy broke up the wealth of Spain. Philip left Spain to his successors financially weakened, but strong in the enjoyment of religious unity and peace. Philip died September 15, 1598, in the Escorial, the great palace, monastery and burying place of Spanish kings built by him without regard to expense. His last words were: "Yes, I die a Catholic in the faith and in the obedience of the Holy Catholic and Roman Church."

399. Philip's Character. — Philip II. was personally unambitious, pacific, and deeply and sincerely religious. To defend Catholic Christendom against the invasions of the Islam and the ravages of Protestantism was the aim of his existence. He waged all his wars, save the first with Paul IV. and France, and his occupation of Portugal, against the enemies of the Church and under a profound sense of duty. He was regular and frugal in his habits of life, accessible to every petitioner however humble, laborious with his pen even to excess, but averse to physical exertions; shy of public display but of haughty reserve and punctiliousness in his stately court, a thorough Spaniard in all his feelings and sympathies. Calm moderation in good fortune and religious resignation under every affliction, domestic or public, was a prominent trait of his character. Philip's great failing was his distrust of others. He made an exception, however, in the case of the scoundrel Antonio Perez, who abused his confidence, and by misrepresentations urged him on to acts of violence. When the rascalities of Perez were discovered, and severely punished, the fugitive favorite became the implacable enemy of his benefactor. The outrageous falsehoods which he published in France became a source for the maligners of Philip II.

400. Philip's Government. — On account of this distrust Philip's government became a strictly personal rule. The Cortes and States-General might meet and advise, but the final decision rested with the king. Philip was his own sole minister, laboring day after day like a clerk among his piles of dispatches and reports, personally managing even the minutest details of administration. His internal administration was carried on in a spirit of scrupulous justice. So effective was his watchfulness over the courts of justice, that no country in Europe could vie with Spain in its

public security. His temper was slow, cautious, often losing itself in delays and hesitations, sacrificing present opportunities for distant chances. Hence most of his undertakings when not ending in failure, obtained but a partial success.

Philip has been represented by partisan writers as "the demon of the South." He must be judged by the standard of his age and surroundings. "Attacked with the utmost violence by bitter and unscrupulous enemies, he in self-defense struck blows which it is impossible wholly to justify, and had recourse to measures meriting only censure." In an age of fierce strife Philip was a man of his time; but "equitable justice requires the severity of our judgment to fall with a thousandfold heavier force on his opponents and enemies." (Prof. Poulet.) Notwithstanding his real faults Philip II. embodied the genius of the Spanish race with all "its great qualities and undeniable failures." "We cast aside with impatient disgust the silly and wicked tradition which, through centuries, has made into a bloodthirsty tyrant a king who placed God's service in the foremost rank, and sacrificed to it his happiness and his peace through life." (Dr. Baumgarten.)

401. The Rise of Puritanism. — Whilst the Catholics were persecuted another religious party gathered strength in England, the Puritans, fierce and narrow-minded Calvinists, filled with a hatred of Rome, which extended itself even to the few usages which the Anglican Establishment had retained from the ancient Church. To repress this sect, Elisabeth turned the machinery of the High Commission against the Puritans. This court, made permanent, and presided over by the Archbishop of Canterbury, wielded the almost unlimited power of the crown. Puritan resistance to uniformity of worship was met with measures of repression. On one occasion two hundred Puritan ministers were driven from their holdings. The Puritans appealed to the people through the press, by publishing the scurrilous pamphlets of "Martin Maprelate," whereupon the press was effectively gagged by the Star-Chamber. For the present Elisabeth's policy was successful, but the strife between Puritanism and the crown, begun in Elisabeth's reign, grew into a fatal conflict under her successors.

402. Material Prosperity Under Elisabeth. — There are various causes which explain Elisabeth's popularity with the Protestant part of the nation. Elisabeth, in her public utterances, always posed as the friend of the commons. Her private vices, the wild adventures and coarse profligacy of her court, were unknown to the people at large, whilst her display of magnificence, and the brilliant retinues that accompanied her in her frequent progresses through the country, caught the public fancy. Her thrift and economy, the income drawn from licensed freebooting, the monopolies which she sold and the presents which she extorted from favorites and courtiers, and the enormous fines wrung from the Catholic gentry, enabled her to forego more general forms of taxation. The spirit of naval adventure grew strong in her reign. Humphrey Gilbert and Martin Frobisher, in quest of a northwestern

passage to Cathay, discovered portions of North America. Sir Walter Raleigh sailed up the Orinoco, and made a first settlement in the colony of Virginia. Francis Drake, Hawkins, Sir John Norris and George Clifford, the spendthrift earl of Cumberland, carried on an incessant guerrilla warfare at sea and enriched Elisabeth's treasury with their spoils. – The queen's economy, bordering on stinginess, made her avoid wars and endeavor to gain her ends by the most unscrupulous means of a dishonest diplomacy. Accordingly, England being in a state of peace during the greatest part of her reign, commerce, industry and agriculture began to flourish. By issuing coin of full value, Elisabeth's government promoted a widespread commerce with foreign nations, as far as Russia and Moscovy, an outlet of trade opened already by Mary Tudor.

In consequence of the wars in the Netherlands London developed into the general mart of Europe. The fisheries in the Channel, in the German ocean, and on the coasts of Newfoundland grew more and more valuable. The vessels of the increasing merchant fleet visited not only the Scandinavian, Baltic, and Mediterranean ports but the shores of East and West India and Africa. Gold dust and ivory were imported from Guinea. Here John Hawkins founded and developed the slave trade, and was the first to transport captured negroes to the labor fields of the New World.

The skill of Flemish artisans and the adoption of the weaving-loom enabled English traders to export annually 100,000 pieces of cloth chiefly to the Netherlands. Grazing lands were again turned into arable lands and increased the prosperity of the farmers. The general comforts in dwelling, furniture and living were considerably raised among the middle and lower classes in Elisabeth's reign. This prosperity, however, owing to the oppression under which the Catholics groaned, was not the prosperity of the nation, but that of one-half obtained at the expense of the other half.

403. The Elisabethan Literature. — One of the glories coincident with Elisabeth's reign is the "Elisabethan Literature," which grew out of the consciousness of England's national greatness, the boundless ambitions of those stirring times, and the increased leisure and comfort, which a long peace and increasing prosperity offered to men of genius. In the latter part of Elisabeth's reign English literature rose to its height and was enriched by Sir Philip Sidney's verses, Spenser's graceful but bigoted Fairie Queen, Shakspeare's immortal plays, Hooker's stately prose, and the philosophical writings of the younger Francis Bacon, not to speak of a crowd of less gifted imitators.

404. Character of Elisabeth · Her Death, 1603. – According to estimates of unbiased Protestant historians, "Elisabeth inherited from Henry VIII. her frank and hearty address, her love of popularity and of free inter-

course with the people, her dauntless courage and amazing self-confidence, her impetuous will, her pride and her furious outbursts of anger." Her conversation was always sprinkled with oaths, but in her angry moods it abounded with imprecations. From Anne Boleyn she inherited her gayety, splendor, love of pleasure, unbounded vanity and reckless frivolity. Elisabeth was possessed of a cold, practical, tentative intellect, trying a hundred plans till she hit the right one. Her scheming mind was wholly uninfluenced by any religious or moral principles. She rejoiced in intrigue for the sake of intrigue. The secret of her success was in the adroitness and finesse with which she played off her enemies against one another. "Nothing is more revolting, but nothing is more characteristic of the queen than her shameless mendacity." To sentiments of chaste affection, sympathy, generosity or gratitude, her cold, cruel and calculating temper was a complete stranger. She yearned for the approbation of her Protestant subjects, and gained it by providing for them an era of material prosperity and external splendor. Only in the last years of her reign, when her favorite Essex rose and was sent to the block, when a new generation had grown up with new interests, when her last Parliament raised bitter and unanimous complaints against royal grants of monopolies, and the Puritan spirit was stirring in every shire, the accustomed acclamations of the people became hushed in a moody silence unrelieved by the conquest of Ireland.

The Christian fortitude and heroic patience of Philip II. on his bed of suffering, and the scenes of gloom and insane despair marking Elisabeth's last days, throw a strong light on the characters of the two most prominent rulers of the period.

Baumstark: *Philip II. and Other Lives* (see foregoing sections). — Gachard: *Lettres de Philippe II. à ses filles* (reveal his deep love and solicitude for his children). — Mignet: *Philippe II. et Antonio Perez.* — W. C. Robinson: *Philip II. and His Vindication.* — The same: *The Character of Philip II.*: M. '77, 3, 64. — Gams: *Kirchengesch. von Spanien*, l. c. — Havemann: *Darstellungen aus der innern Geschichte Spaniens* (15th, 16th and 17th centuries). — Leo: *Universal Gesch.*, v. 3. — *Philip II.*, St. v. 9, p. 335; *Katholik*, '85, 1, p. 270.

Stevenson: *Calendar of the Foreign State Papers of the Time of Elisabeth.* — S. Hubert Burke: *Hist. Portraits of the Tudor Dynasty.* — E. S. Beesly: *Elisabeth; Growth of British Policy; The England of Elisabeth:* E. R. '77, 2, p. 199. — Robinson: *Queen Elisabeth and the Valois Princes:* E. H. R. v. 2, p. 40. On *Francis Bacon:* E. R. '61, 1, p. 309; '79, 2, p. 395. — Felix Makower: *The Constit. Hist. and Constitution of the Church of England* (important for its documents). — H. N. Birt, O. S. B.: *Some Troubles of the Elisabethan Episcopate:* D. R. '97, 3, p. 125. — W. A. Shaw: *Elisabethan Presbyterianism:* E. H. R. v. 3, p. 655. — T. E. Bridgett: *Blunders and Forgeries. Hist. Essays.*

A. Zimmerman, S. J.: *Die Spanische Armada und die spaetere Sagenbildung*: St. v. 48, p. 38. — Edwin Pears: *The Spanish Armada and the Ottoman Porte:* E. H. R. v. 8, p. 429. — T. G. Law: *Martyrs of the Year of the Armada:* M. '79, 1, p. 71. — M. Oppenheim: *The Royal and Merchant Navy under Elisabeth;* also: *Royal Navy under Elis.:* Round-Oppenheim, E. H. R. v. 9, p. 709. — C. R. Markham: *The Sea Fathers.* — Fox Brown: *English Seamen under the Tudors.* — R. Southey-D. Hannay: *English Seamen; Early Engl. Mariners:* M. vol. 10, pp. 70, 241. — Southey: *Life of Lord Howard of Effingham.* — L. Creighton: *Life of Sir Walter Raleigh.* — H. R. Fox: *Sir Philip Sidney.* — J. Corbett: *Drake.* — *Die Englische Flotte under K. Elisabeth:* H. P. B. v. 124, p. 74. Green, Gardiner, and other Histories of England.

§ 9.

MEXICO, THE PHILIPPINES, AND THE SPANISH COLONIES OF SOUTH AMERICA.

405. Centers of Discoveries.— America before its settlement by European nations was inhabited by Indian tribes. Three sources of prehistoric immigration are mentioned: (1) Turanian tribes from Asia came by the Behring Straits, where the Kurilian, Aleutian and Fox Islands form a sort of bridge between the two continents. Others may have come from East India by way of the South Sea Islands. Still others coming from Phoenicia and Egypt probably crossed the Mediterranean and Atlantic, as the ancient legend of an island Atlantis and other antiquities seem to indicate.

The universal excitement caused by the discoveries of Columbus led to the exploration within about thirty years of the entire coast from Labrador in the north to the Fire Islands in the south. In 1513 Vasco Nuñez de Balboa, accompanied by Pizarro, discovered the Pacific by crossing the Isthmus of Panama from Darien. In 1520 the Portuguese mariner Magellaes or Magellan, sailing under the Spanish flag, found a westerly way to the Pacific by the straits which bear his name. The main centers of discovery in South America were Panama, Bahia and the mouth of the La Plata. Panama, since 1518 the capital of Central America, became the starting-point for all the *Spanish* discoveries on the Pacific. From Bahia or San Salvador in Brazil, first settled in 1510, the *Portuguese* extended their conquests north and south on the Atlantic coast. From the mouth of the river La Plata, discovered by Juan Diaz de Solis in 1516, the *Spaniards* entered into the interior of the continent.

406. Mexico. — The *Mayas* of *Yucatan* first visited by Hernandez Cordova in 1517 gave the Spaniards the earliest tidings of the great Mexican Empire of Montezuma to which the Mayas were subject. Mexico was since 1196 inhabited by the Aztecs. Their form of government was monarchical with a powerful nobility. The palaces and temples both in Yucatan and Mexico prove that these nations had made considerable advance in civilization. The Aztec system of religion was a horrible wholesale Moloch cult demanding hecatombs of human victims for its great festivities. The blood flowed in torrents down the slopes of the great sacrificial pyramid, and the butchering of the victims by the so-called priests was carried on from morn till nightfall on great occasions. Hernandez Cortez on his own responsibility undertook in 1519 an expedition against Mexico and founded Vera Cruz. Greeted as a savior by the subjected nations, he reached Mexico, the capital, without opposition. He boldly seized the person of Montezuma and forced him and his nobles to pay homage to the king of Spain. The cruelty of the Spaniards during Cortez' absence caused the hostility of the native population. After his return a furious rising of the Mexicans in which Montezuma was slain by his own subjects for his sub-

mission to Spain, compelled Cortez to evacuate the city with terrible loss. Reinforced he fought a successful campaign, and stormed and partly destroyed Mexico after a siege of three months. August, 1521, Guatamozin, the last Aztec emperor, was executed. Cortez rebuilt the city and began in 1526 to introduce Christian civilization into New Spain or Mexico. The first act of Cortez after the conquest was the foundation of a grand hospital in 1527. A couple of years after the city fell into the hands of Cortez, the religion of the God of Peace and the industries of civilized life were taught the natives whom the horrible Aztecs would have butchered by the hundred. Ordinary schools were opened as early as 1524 and supplemented by industrial schools for Indians in 1543. The first bishop of Mexico, Zumarraga, set up in 1536 the first printing press in the New World, 102 years before New England thought of a printing press. No other nation has established in its colonies so extensive works of beneficence as the Spanish. The Royal Hospital of Mexico for the Indians, begun in 1553, covered three and a half acres, and harbored in the great epidemic of 1782, 9,000 patients. The much maligned Spanish government covered in the course of little more than a century a territory of 5,000 miles' stretch with churches, schools, courts of justice, aqueducts and roads so splendid as still to cause the wonder of the traveler.

407. The Philippines. — The Philippines were discovered by Magellan in 1521, who raised the Spanish flag in Cebu, but was killed by the natives. It was, however, reserved to Mexico to settle these eastern islands and to keep up closer relations with the Philippines than Spain itself. The inhabitants belonged to the Malay race and were divided into three branches: the Tagals, the Visayas who inhabit the southern islands, and the Pampangas who occupy a part of Luzon to the north of Manila. There was no central government. Chiefs ruled limited districts with independent power, and commanded their warriors in the frequent inter-tribal wars. The inhabitants raised rice, bananas and other fruits and roots, fished and hunted and traded among one another. Practices of witchcraft and dances in honor of spirits, benevolent or malevolent — with neither temples nor public worship — formed their religion. The Spanish politicians opposed any outlay for the acquisition of these islands because they had neither spices nor gold to any amount, and offered little prospect for a revenue. But the desire of extending the faith was stronger than the hope of gain, and Philip II. emphatically declared that to save one soul he was ready to spend the wealth of the Indies. Accordingly he ordered the viceroy of Mexico in 1560 to fit out a fleet and to found a post in the Philippines. The expedition, consisting of four vessels and carrying fifty missionaries and civilians, a crew of 150 men and 200 soldiers, sailed in 1564 from Acapulco. Legaspi, a veteran soldier of the best type, was commander. Father Urdaneta, who from a distinguished geographer had become an Augustinian friar, was the soul of the undertaking. Landing at Cebu a treaty was con-

cluded with the Malays, by which the murder of Magellan was forgiven and nothing was asked from the natives but provisions and security for the members of the expedition. From this first settlement on Cebu island, Legaspi started on his voyages of exploration, founded Manila on Luzon in 1571, and pushed his discoveries to Panay, Negros and Mindanao. The Mohammedans of the Sulu Islands were the only enemies that gave serious trouble. The wars waged from Manila were almost wholly defensive, against Chinese pirates, Dutch corsairs and hostile Sulus.

408. **Peaceful Conquest and Civilization.** — The conquest of the Philippines, not by soldiers but by Augustinians, Franciscans, Jesuits and Dominicans, was carried on under the most favorable circumstances. The occupation of the islands took place at a time when the principle of law, that every Indian must be treated as a free man, was firmly established in the colonial legislation of Spain. The Europeans never formed more than one-thirtieth of the entire population. The few thousand soldiers kept in the Philippines were wholly inadequate for purposes of conquest, and were used only in case of foreign invasions. The missionaries quietly settled among the inhabitants, preached to the grown up men and women, and gathered the children into schools. The chiefs while recognizing the supremacy of the Spaniards continued to direct the public life of the natives, who everywhere grouped themselves around a church and a school as the center of their settlements. The taxes were light, and usually paid in produce. The right of the natives to their own land, property and personal freedom was religiously respected. To facilitate the admission of the natives to Holy Orders, the University of San Tomas, equipped after the full European plan, was founded by the third Archbishop of Manila, and indiscriminately opened to Europeans and natives, whilst numerous colleges were founded by the Jesuits and Dominicans to prepare the natives for the University. Many high officials, judges, auditors, and secular and ecclesiastical dignitaries of pure Pampanga blood, were drawn from these schools. The Christian population grew apace. In the beginning of the seventeenth century the native Catholics numbered over 200,000, in 1750 considerably over a milllon, while the official returns of 1896 report a Catholic population of nearly 7,000,000, exclusive of the savage tribes of Luzon, or the Mohammedans of Sulu and Mindanao. It speaks volumes for the Spanish rule, that the Archipelago was blessed with three centuries of internal peace. It was only in the nineteenth century, that the masonic governments of Spain began to prey upon the inhabitants and to slander the friars, only to be paid back in their own coin by the *masonic* insurrection of the Philippines.

409. **Ancient Peru.** — Peru was founded by a powerful chief of the Aymaras, about 1000 of the Christian era. It comprised what is now Ecuador, Peru, northern Chili, the Brazilian province of the Amazons, and Bolivia. Fourteen emperors in succession ruled over this gigantic commonwealth

which was a mixture of theocracy and absolutism, of aristocracy and communism. The emperor was called Inca, "First Son of the Sun." The relatives of the male line were also styled "Children of the Sun." The Inca was the sole lord of the soil. The best lands in each community were "sunlands," destined to defray the expenses of public worship. All the rest was "Incaland," of which one-third was apportioned to the peasant class, and distributed by an elaborate system of sliding tenures, each holder annually changing his lots. The land first tilled was the sunland, then that set apart for the support of the helpless; next the portion assigned to the laboring families, and last in order, the land destined for the maintenance of the Inca and his court. The Inca annually reserved the surplus of the revenues for the support of the people in times of famine. The people were bound to public services for the court and the commonwealth, to till the common lands, to build high roads and aqueducts, and to erect the monumental buildings which still excite the admiration of the traveler. The amount of work to be done by each was regulated according to age and strength. Labor in the unwholesome mines was restricted to three months in the year. Relatives of the Inca, priests, officials and soldiers, were exempt from manual labor. The capital was Cuzco. Its wards were named after the several provinces and inhabited by immigrants from the respective provinces. A perpetual guard of fire signals on the mountain tops was maintained as well as a postal service of runners.

410. **Spanish Peru.** — The Spaniards received the first intelligence of the Inca realm, "the land of gold," about 1522. After two journeys of exploration Francisco Pizarro, an unlettered but energetic adventurer, obtained permission from Charles V. to conquer Peru for Spain. In 1531 he landed with 300 infantry and 28 horse in the Bay of San Matheo, and founded at St. Miguel the first Spanish colony. Reinforced from Panama he marched into the interior and learned on his way that Huascar and Atahualpa, the sons of the last Inca Huyana Capac, had waged a war in which Atahualpa the younger had defeated and imprisoned his elder brother. Having crossed the Cordilleras Pizarro entered the city of Cujamarca near which the forces of Atahualpa were encamped. The Inca, invited by Pizarro, was treacherously made a prisoner. Fearing lest his deposed brother might escape and make common cause with the strangers, Atahualpa gave orders from his confinement to drown Huascar. Thereupon he was tried by Pizarro as a fratricide and executed 1533. Manco, Huascar's brother, placed himself under Pizarro's protection, and was inaugurated as nominal Inca. Pizarro then occupied Cuzco, and founded the new capital, Lima, near the seashore, which, under his energetic superintendence and the constant influx of migration, rose with wonderful rapidity.

411. **Civil Wars in Peru.** — A rising of the Peruvians under Manco assumed a very threatening aspect, when Almagro, Pizarro's chief companion,

instigated a civil war against the conqueror. Pizarro by his superior generalship overcame his foes and sent Almagro to the scaffold. Seven years later Pizarro fell victim to a conspiracy of his former opponents, 1541. His younger brother Alonzo, setting aside and defeating the appointee of the crown, assumed charge of the government of Peru. In view of these disturbances Charles V. named Blasco Nuñez Vela first viceroy of Peru, and established the court of Royal Audience at Lima with jurisdiction over the whole of South America. The viceroy was to proclaim the Emperor's wise and humane law of 1542, which declared the natives of all the Spanish possessions in America free vassals of the crown. The whole Spanish population rose against this decree; the viceroy was slain, and Alonzo Pizarro made himself master of the coast from Panama to Chili. Charles V. in 1545, sent Pedro de la Gasca, an ecclesiastic, with unlimited powers to Peru, as President of the Audience. Gasca, utterly indifferent to any consideration save the call of honor and duty, succeeded by his eminent prudence in restoring perfect loyalty throughout Peru. Only Pizarro refused to submit and suffered the fate of a rebel. Although the law of 1542 was withdrawn for the time, Gasca placed the condition of the natives on a better footing than they had enjoyed under the Incas. He left Peru in 1550, followed by the blessings of both Spaniards and Indians.

412. **Chili.** — Chili was discovered and conquered by the Spaniards from Peru. Diego Almagro in 1555 subdued the northern provinces. Pedro Valdivia was the real conqueror and colonizer of Chili, and founded in 1541 Santiago. His name is unstained by the cruelties which cling to the memory of Peru's conquerors. Valdivia fell in the Araucanian war, 1553.

413. **The Araucanians.** — The external history of Chili consists in a 200 years' war with the Araucanians, one of the most remarkable Indian nations of South America. The distinctive trait of the Araucanian character is a passionate love of and attachment to the land of their forefathers. They lived in scattered villages by the banks of rivers or in easily irrigated plains. Their government, an aristocratic republic, — unlike that of the ancient Peruvians is based on the private ownership of the soil. They were divided into four commonwealths from north to south, each subdivided into four provinces and then again into nine smaller political communities. The government was carried on by three orders of nobility, the lower subordinate to the higher, and all having their respective vassals. The Toquis or governors rule the Commonwealth. They are independent of one another, but enter into confederations, when the general welfare acquires it. The Arch-Ulmenes rule the provinces, the Ulmenes the smaller political unities. These dignities are hereditary in the male line and proceed by primo-geniture. The Araucanians acknowledged a Supreme Being, the Universal Ruler, and the immortality of the soul; but they practiced polygamy. Their laws are unwritten usage, which have for their object the preservation of

personal liberty and of the established form of government. The subjects are not liable to any levy, personal service or contribution to their chiefs except in time of war. Whenever the Grand Council of the four governments determine to go to war, they select a chief commander from the Toquis, who, for the time being, exercises dictatorial powers, all the other authorities taking the oath of fidelity to him. In their warfare with the Spaniards they conducted regular sieges, stormed towns, fought pitched battles, in some of which they annihilated the Spanish forces. The Toquis used to challenge Spanish commanders to single combats, which sometimes lasted over two hours in the presence of both armies. Many a Spanish town south of the Biobio was swept out of existence never to be rebuilt. In a treaty of 1640, mediated by the Jesuit Valdiva, the river Biobio was established as boundary between the Spanish and Araucanian territories. But the latter, supported by the Dutch, again and again renewed their attacks on the Spaniards. In the Peace of 1775 the northern Araucanians obtained the right of maintaining an ambassador at Santiago to see to their interests. The southern tribes preserved their independence.

414. Paraguay. — Although the Portuguese under de Solis discovered the banks of the La Plata, yet the country soon passed into the hands of the Spaniards. The Portuguese had penetrated through Paraguay to Peru, but in their return laden with silver were nearly annihilated by the Indians. The silver was seized by Sebastian Cabot, who in 1526 had sailed up the great river. Not knowing the origin of the metal he conjectured that Paraguay was rich in silver mines, and called the river La Plata. To secure the country to Spain, Charles V. dispatched a fleet with 1,200 men under Don Pedro de Mendoza, who founded Buenos Ayres, 1535. Asuncion, founded in 1536, remained for many years the center and capital of the new conquests. The first governor and captain-general de Vaca was overthrown for his zeal in protecting the Indians against the tyrannical Irala. The false opinion of the country's richness in precious metals drew great numbers of indolent and heartless adventurers to Paraguay, who completely frustrated the humane intentions of Charles V. for the welfare of the natives.

H. F. Bancroft: *Early Chroniclers; History of the Pacific States; History of Mexico; Hist. of Central America.* — Las Casas: *La découverte des Indes; Oeuvres.* — Helps: *Life of Las Casas; Conquerors of the New World; Spanish Conquest.* — Hale: *Story of Mexico.* — Routier: *L'Histoire du Mexique.* — Cortes: *Account of the City of Mexico; Dispatches to Charles V.; Fifth Letter to Charles V.* — Helps: *Life of Cortes.* — Prescott: *Conquest of Mexico.* — Solis: *Conquest of Mexico.* — Fancourt: *Hist. of Yucatan.* — B. J. Anide; *The Story of the Philippines.* — Daupier: *Account of the Philippines.* — Cieza de Leon: *Chronicle of Peru.* — Markham: *Cuzco and Lima; Peru; History of Peru.* — Prescott: *Conquest of Peru.* — Helps: *Life of Pizarro.* — Pratt: *Francisco Pizarro.* — Hancock: *History of Chile.* — L. R. Smith: *The Araucanians.* — Charlevoix: *Hist. of Paraguay.* — Wilson: *The Conquest of Mexico.* — L'Abbe Brasseur de Bourbourg: *Hist. des nations civilisées du Mexique et de l'Amerique centrale* (before Columbus.) — Wiener: *Institutions politiques, religieuses, économiques et sociales de l'empire des Incas.*

§ 10.

THE PORTUGUESE IN BRAZIL — CHURCH AND STATE IN THE COLONIES.

415. Brazil. — The only Portuguese possession in South America was Brazil. This immense territory on the southern Atlantic, named after the brazil wood (pao do brazil: wood of the glowing coal) was discovered in 1500 by Vincente Yañez Pinzon, a companion of Columbus, for Spain (Cape St. Augustino on the Amazons), and by Pedro Alvarez Cabral, about 10° S., for Portugal. The disputes between Spain and Portugal arising from this double discovery were finally settled in favor of Portugal by a papal decision, 1549. The real colonization began 1532, when king John III. divided the country into 15 feudal principalities, of which, however, only seven were organized. In addition to these principalities, which were in course of time united to the crown, Brazil at the end of the 16th century had eight royal captaincies. Thus Brazil at an early period received its permanent character of a federative monarchy, ruled since 1720 by a viceroy who resided first at Bahia, and since 1760 at Rio de Janeiro. The discovery of gold in 1702 and of diamonds in 1724 in the province of Minas Guaes gave a new impulse to the prosperity of Brazil.

416. The Dutch War. — The territory of Brazil was first invaded by the French Huguenots who attempted a settlement in the bay of Rio de Janeiro (1567-1580). When Spain and Portugal were united under Philip II. Brazil became exposed to the attacks of Philip's enemies, France, England and the revolted Netherlands. Sir John Hawkins, Francis Drake, and Walter Raleigh, appeared now on the Atlantic, now on the Pacific coast, plundering the Spaniards and Portuguese wherever they found them vulnerable, and treating the inhabitants on either side with the impartiality of professional freebooters. The most important undertaking against Brazil was the Dutch war, 1623–1654. Up to 1637 the Dutch had conquered three captaincies and taken 547 vessels and over 30,000,000 florins of prize money. In 1638 count Maurice of Nassau arrived as governor of the Dutch possessions and conquered three other provinces. When in 1640 Portugal became independent of Spain, a truce of ten years was concluded between Holland and Portugal. Under cover of this truce and under secret orders from the home government Maurice treacherously extended his conquests so far as to lay hold on fourteen coast provinces from which the Brazilians had in their good faith withdrawn the garrisons. But this treachery, aggravated by the insolence, brutality and narrow bigotry of the conquerors, recoiled on themselves. A liberator rose in Joam Fernandez Vieira, one of the wealthiest planters in Brazil. The mainspring of his public life was an ardent devotion to the Catholic faith. For the cause of religion he staked all his worldly goods. He was ably assisted by Camaram, a powerful Indian chief who was in the

habit of daily attending Mass and reciting the Office. Beginning with a handful of trusty adherents, unsupported, sometimes even opposed for political reasons by the government at Lisbon, Vieira steadily pursued his object through all the vicissitudes of a ten years' campaign and achieved a complete success. Two battles at the foot of the Guarapa hills in Pernambuco, in which the Dutch lost 2,300 men with the whole of their artillery, and the capitulation of their capital Recife put an end to the Dutch occupation of Brazil.

417. Government of the Spanish Colonies. — The highest authority over the Spanish colonies resided in the Supreme Council, established by Ferdinand the Catholic in 1511, and perfected by Charles V. Its sessions were held in the palace of the royal residence. All laws and ordinances concerning the colonies originated in this body. It nominated all crown officers, took cognizance of all intelligence arriving from the colonies and of every scheme for the improvement of the administration. The House of Trade, established at Seville, was subject to the Supreme Council. The Spanish conquests were originally divided into two, later into four, vast governments, ruled by viceroys. They were the viceroyalty of New Spain or Mexico; the viceroyalty of Peru; the viceroyalty of New Granada, in the north separated from Peru in 1739, and comprising what are now the republics of Ecuador, New Granada, and Venezuela, and the Brazilian provinces of the Amazons, with the capital of Santa Fé de Bogotá; and the viceroyalty of La Plata in the south, separated from Peru in 1776. It comprised the provinces of Buenos Ayres, Tucuman, Chiquito (now Uruguay and the Argentine Republic) Paraguay, and Potosi (now Bolivia). The viceroy represented the king, and wielded full regal powers in his respective government. Viceroys held office for five years and upwards. Their assistant officers were appointed some by the king, others by the viceroy himself; but once appointed all were subject to the latter. The administration of justice was vested in the Court of Royal Audience, of which the number of members varied according to circumstances. There were eleven Audiences in the Spanish possessions, four in Mexico, and seven in South America.

418. Population. — The commingling of Europeans, Indians and imported negroes created a new society of which the elements were: The *Chapetones*, Spaniards who arrived from Europe; Creoles, descendants of the Spaniards born in America; Mulattos, the offspring of Europeans and negroes; Mestizas, the offspring of Europeans and Indians; Negroes pure and simple; and last in the order of society, the Indians. The exclusive rule of the Spaniards was strongly marked, expecially in Mexico and Peru. No stranger was permitted to enter these countries without the permission of the Spanish government. Down to 1778 only registered Spanish vessels could trade with Mexico in the harbors of Vera Cruz and Acapulco. The native Mexican was not allowed to cultivate the olive and some other prod-

ucts or trade with any other nation save Spain. Of seventy successive viceroys only four were born in Mexico. Of 602 captains-general only 14, of 706 bishops only 55 were Creoles.

419. The Indians. — The Indians were divided into two classes, those who were immediate vassals to the crown, and those who formed part of an encomienda. The former had to pay a small tax into the royal treasury, the latter to the holder of the grant. The Indians living in towns were subject to the Spanish laws and magistrates, those inhabiting their own villages were in charge of their own caziques. Each district had, besides, a Protector of the Indians (Las Casas) who had to defend their rights before the local courts, and if necessary before the Supreme Council. In the hospitals of Mexico, Lima, Cuzco and other cities the Indians were treated with the same charity as the Spaniards.

420. Encomiendas. — Encomiendas were estates with a corresponding number of serfs attached to them, which the Spanish government granted to the colonists. The system of encomiendas was already introduced by Columbus in Hispaniola. The Indians assigned to the Spaniards had to work from two to five months of the year for their masters. They were to be instructed in religion, to be cared for and treated as members of the family. The labors of the Indians apportioned to encomiendas consisted, according to law, in works of necessity, tilling common lands, building bridges and roads. They could not be employed for private or commercial profit. It was, however, difficult and often impossible to enforce these laws. In the hands of unscrupulous settlers, deplorably common, the system degenerated into the most oppressive and cruel slavery. In no Spanish possession were these abuses practiced with more outrageous cruelty than in Paraguay. When the supply of forced laborers became insufficient, slave hunts on a large scale were organized. A powerful colony of Portuguese robbers, founded 1554, at St. Paul, lived exclusively from the hunt and traffic in human flesh. They depopulated whole Indian provinces. Within five years they dragged 300,000 slaves, not only wild Indians, but domesticated Christians, to Rio Janeiro, of whom nine-tenths fell victims to the hardships of the march.

421 The Church and Civilization.— The Church in the New World had a threefold task to perform: to convert and civilize the aborigines, to defend their rights against the evil passions of the colonists, and to care for the immigrant Europeans by the establishment of a regular and permanent hierarchy. The conversion of the Indians was accomplished chiefly by religious Orders. The first missionaries in the Spanish possessions were the Benedictines and the Franciscans who arrived in the last decade of the 15th century, and the Dominicans, who joined them in 1510.

The Jesuits began to be sent to South America in 1549, to Mexico in 1572.

Men of eminent learning and piety like the **Ven.** Joseph Anchieta, the Bl. Ignazio Azevedo, studied the languages of the natives, won their confidence, rooted out cannibalism, gathered the dwellers of the wilderness into settled habitations, taught them to read, write and sing, to sow and reap, to build houses, schools and churches. Antonio Vieyra, missionary, statesman and author, gained on a single occasion the allegiance of 40,000 free Indians to the Catholic faith and to the Portuguese crown. The Fathers Ruiz de Montoya and Baraza baptized each 100,000 Indians. The Franciscan Saint, Francis of Solano, besides being the first to preach the faith in Paraguay, has earned by his labors and his success the title of Apostle of Peru. At Carthagena the Jesuit Saint, Peter Claver, spent a life-long martyrdom in bettering the lot of the imported negro slaves. The Dominican, St. Rose of Lima, spread far and wide the invigorating perfume of her heroic virtues. All these Orders who worked among the aborigines, had also their martyrs. A great number of missionaries suffered death on the Orinoco. The Jesuits alone had over 70 martyrs in the Spanish possessions, whilst five died for the faith in Brazil, and Ignazio Azevedo with 39 companions was murdered at sea on his way to Brazil by French Huguenots (1570).

422. The Hierarchy and the Defense of the Indians. — In the beginning of the seventeenth century there were five Archbishops, 27 bishoprics, 400 monasteries, and innumerable parishes in Latin America. Two fully equipped universities at Mexico and Lima, and numerous colleges for higher education became as many centers of European learning. It was a special task of the Church to defend the rights of the Indians. On this question the Church and the colonists were nearly always at variance. Almost all the Orders and most of the prelates condemned Indian slavery and oppression. The great Dominican Bartholomew Las Casas, the champion of the Indians, crossed the Atlantic fourteen times to obtain the freedom of the Indians. He obtained his first success when Ferdinand published the "Laws of Burgos" in 1512 for the protection of the Indians. During the minority of Charles V. he was strongly supported in his work of Indian emancipation by Cardinal Ximenes, and his colleague Adrian, afterwards Adrian VI. Then followed a period of disappointments caused by selfish courtiers and interested politicians. But in 1537, Paul III. forbade any Catholic to either enslave or plunder the Indians under pain of excommunication. In 1542 at last, Charles V. embodied all the measures proposed by Las Casas in the "New Laws," confirmed afterwards by Philip II.

The chief clause was: "We order and command that henceforth, for no cause or pretext whatever * * * can any Indian be made a slave." The other clause which changed all the personal services of the Indians into a reasonable rent, met so violent an opposition (rebellion in Peru, see no. 411, threatened rebellion of Mexico), that it was not fully enforced till the reign of Charles III. But personal slavery at least remained abolished in

all the transatlantic states by the efforts of Las Casas. Under this law of Charles V. after a period of hot opposition on the part of the colonists, 130,000 Indians were freed in Mexico. What Las Casas did for the Indians under Spanish dominion, Antonio Vieyra did for Brazil. Though ruthlessly persecuted by governors and settlers for his fearless defense of the Indians, he saw his labors so far crowned with success that throughout the Portuguese possessions, with the exception of the robber nest of St. Paul, the condition of the natives was greatly improved, and every pure Indian demanding his freedom was declared free by law.

"On a general review of Spanish legislation with respect to the treatment of the natives of the New World, it is admitted on all sides that the government from Isabella onward was most solicitious for their spiritual and material well-being." (Watson.) Chief amongst the causes that contributed to thwart the wise and humane legislation on the part of the mother country were (1) the immense distance of the colonies from Spain, and their difficult and irregular communication with the mother country, which at best could be had only once a year. (2) The contempt in which many of the discoverers and conquistadores (conquerers) held the Indians. Many went so far as to deny to the Indians the dignity of human nature. (3) The greed, rapacity and cruelty of individual colonists and adventurers, especially of the nobility who were too indolent to work. (4) The self-interest of those officials whose duty it was to see the laws and regulations executed.

423 **The Jesuit Reductions.** — The Jesuit Reductions of Uruguay, Paraguay and La Plata deserve special mention as a unique combination of religious, civic, industrial and military life, the most effective method known heretofore of civilizing savage tribes. The reductions were Christian republics of converted Indians who, whilst politically subject to the crown of Spain, enjoyed complete home rule under the guidance of the missionaries. The first reductions of the Guaranis were founded between 1610 and 1620. The reductions were built upon the principle of isolation from all Europeans. Religion was the all-pervading motive. Every reduction had two or more priests and a number of lay brothers. The people met for divine service every morning and evening. The schools flourished. Every Guarani could read and write. The beautiful Guarani tongue as perfected by the Jesuits into a written language was taught at the University of Cordova and is still the language of southeastern America. In the eighteenth century Spanish was added. The Indians chose their own civil officers, a corregidor or chief magistrate, and several regidors and alcaldes or magistrates and judges. Punishments were light, crimes almost unheard of. The terrible slave raids of the Paulistas made it necessary to equip the Indians with firearms. The military forces of the reductions were organized under caziques; the commander in chief was chosen from the ablest of the caziques. Fathers

accompanied the army as chaplains, and Brothers as physicians and nurses. Each reduction had its corps of infantry and cavalry. The reductions could muster 30,000 well-drilled men. Philip IV. called them his most faithful vassals and intrusted to them the defense of Paraguay. Each reduction had its common herd of cattle, its common soil, its granary, armory, its hospice for widows which was at the same time an industrial school for girls. When cultivation in a new reduction was sufficiently advanced, each family obtained its own plot of land. The Indians worked three days on their own and three days on the common land. *Each reduction had its own industry.* Whilst the Indians never betrayed an inventive genius, they were wonderful imitators. Indians, whose forefathers had been cannibals, became skillful carpenters, masons, blacksmiths, turners, carvers, printers and gilders, watchmakers and manufacturers of musical instruments; they cast bells, built organs, constructed horse mills and water works for irrigation. They built plain, but roomy and comfortable houses, and erected magnificent churches and public buildings, which they adorned with their own statuary. Thus in the course of about a century and a half a free, happy and innocent population of far beyond a million of Indians was instructed and civilized by the zealous missionaries.

424. Summary. — The history of every continent unmistakably shows that the evangelization of the world, with very few exceptions, has been carried on by the Latin races. Under the Spanish and Portuguese domination the Church always took root and rapidly spread, human vice and cupidity notwithstanding. While in North America the whole Atlantic seaboard was growing into a great nation of Englishmen, not one Indian village was converted, not one Indian tribe saved from extermination, whilst the country to the rear from the Bay of Hudson to the mouth of the Mississippi, was traversed and evangelized in all its tribes by a little French colony on the shores of the St. Lawrence. In the Philippines in a hundred and forty years a million of Catholic natives have grown into 7,000,000, whilst the 140,000 natives of Hawaii under their New England missionaries have shrunk to 38,000. Of the 13,000,000 inhabitants of Mexico one-half are full-blooded Indians and four-fifths of the rest a mixed breed, leaving about one million pure whites. The amalgamation of the different races, encouraged by the unity of faith and sanctified by lawful marriage has increased the native population so that there still live to-day 12,000,000 pure-blooded Indians, and 14,000,000 Mestizas in Latin America, whilst the Protestant

civilization of the North has nearly swept the native population out of existence.

Southey: *History of Brazil.* — Markham: *Expeditions to the Valley of the Amazons* (1539–1639.) — T. W. M. Marshall: *Christian Missions, their Agents and their Results;* (2 vols., contains numerous references to works and reports on all the foreign missions). — Lummis: *The Awakening of a Nation* (Mexico); *Spanish Pioneers.* — Watson: *Spanish and Portuguese South America.* — Helps: *Life of Las Casas.* — Clinch: *The First Priest in America (Las Casas):* A. C. Q. v. 24, 3, p. 102. — Th. Hughes, S. J.: *Missionary Countries, Old and New:* A. C. Q., v. 24, 1, p. 1. — J. J. O'Shea: *Spain's Legacy to Mexico:* A. C. Q., v. 24, p. 91. — P. Charlevoix: *Hist. du Paraguay.* — Juan d'Escaudon: *Gesch. von Paraguay.* — Moussy: *Les Missions des Jesuits.* — Cathrein, St. v. 25, p. 433. — *Lettres édifiantes,* vol. 7, 8, 9. — Washburn: *The Hist. of Paraguay.*

CHAPTER III.

THE THIRTY YEARS' WAR.

§ 1.

CAUSES OF THE THIRTY YEARS' WAR.

425. Weakness of the Emperors. — The immediate successors of Charles V. were not strong enough to check the advance of Protestantism or to exercise a decisive influence on the conflict of parties.

(a.) Ferdinand I., 1556–64, a sincere Catholic, conciliatory towards the Protestants, yet firm in upholding the Ecclesiastical Reservation in the German diets, was chiefly occupied in defending the Hungarian frontiers against Turkish invasions. At his death he divided the complex of countries which he had united, among his sons, thus founding an Austrian, a Tyrolese, and a Styrian line of the House of Hapsburg.



(b.) Maximilian II. (1564–76) as weak as he was insincere, a Catholic with Catholics, a Protestant at heart, took no steps to prevent violations of the Peace of Augsburg in Germany, and in his own countries he greatly favored the Protestants.

In 1566 Suleyman again overran Hungary, but died in the camp before Sziget, which Zriny heroically defended against an over-

whelming Turkish army, until he, too, met his death shortly after. In a peace concluded with Suleyman's son, Selim II., Maximilian retained a part of Hungary, but like his father Ferdinand, remained tributary to the Sultan.

(c.) Still more unfortunate was the reign of Rudolf II. (1576–1612). He was a scholar, loved sciences and arts, dabbled in alchemy and astrology, but had so wavering and suspicious a temper, that the performance of his official duties became at times an unbearable burden to him. The reaction in favor of Catholicism, which set in during his reign, though not through his agency, made him many enemies among the German Calvinists, while his inactivity in a new Turkish war dissatisfied the people of his hereditary lands.

426. Protestant Encroachments. — The Religious Peace of Augsburg contained two clauses for the defense of what was still left of the Catholic Church in Germany: (a) the Ecclesiastical Reservation, (b) and the limitation of the "jus reformandi," (the so-called right of princes to impose their creed on their subjects,) to the Catholics and the adherents of the Augsburg Confession. Attacks on these two clauses fill the time from 1555 to the outbreak of the Thirty Years' War. (*Eccl. Reserv.*, p. 181, no. 7.)

The Ecclesiastical Reservation was violated by episcopal chapters turning Protestant and electing a Protestant prince as their bishop, or by apostate prelates abdicating for an annual compensation, or by open force, as in the case of Halberstadt.

Thus seventeen bishoprics, a hundred monasteries in the Palatinate alone, and nearly as many in the north, were secularized by Lutheran and Calvinist princes and used by them as a convenient endowment for younger sons and other relatives. As to doctrine, the Protestant divines bitterly wrangled with and persecuted one another with the aid of the secular arm. Whatever the theologians or princes undertook to effect a union in doctrine, only served to increase their dissensions and to multiply sects. The whole controversial literature of the German Protestants is reeking with filthy abuse and invective.

427. The Rise of the Calvinist Party — The limitation of the Peace of Augsburg to the Catholic and Lutheran estates was attacked by a new, rising party of Calvinists. Palsgrave Frederic III. introduced Calvinism in the Palatinate, destroying everything Catholic in churches and monasteries with ruthless barbarity.



John Casimir, the military head of the German Calvinists, repeatedly led his marauding troopers into France and the Low Countries to aid the Huguenots and Gueux. Prince Christian of Anhalt, the diplomatic guide and agent of the party, Maurice of Hesse, the duke of Würtemberg, and other Calvinist princes allied themselves with the Palatine electors. They were constantly in correspondence with Henry of Navarre, William of Orange, Elisabeth of England, and with the Calvinists of Austria, Hungary and Transylvania.

Thus the Germans were divided into three parties: the aggressive Calvinist party, supported by a few Lutheran princes; the defensive Catholic party led by the dukes of Bavaria, and a middle party comprising the majority of the Lutherans who were loyal to the Emperor, led by John George, elector of Saxony.

428. State of the Catholic Church. — Whilst the Protestants became more divided in doctrine, religious zeal was rekindled among the Catholics. The publication of the decrees of Trent, numerous popular missions and the truly reformatory work of the Capuchins, a new branch of Franciscans, and the Jesuits, inspired the people with a fresh fervor. Peter Canisius by his work in the diets, in the pulpit, in the university chairs, and by his Catechism and other religious publications, earned the name of a second Apostle of Germany. While in Protestant Germany public education sank to the lowest level, Jesuit colleges were founded in the principal cities, and attracted by their high efficiency, order and discipline, not only Catholic, but Protestant parents and children. The German College in Rome, and the new Seminaries founded in accordance with the Tridentine decrees, supplied the bishops with exemplary priests. Not only was the spread of Protestantism arrested before the outbreak of the Thirty Years' War, but the Catholic faith was fully re-

stored in the Austrian countries of Styria, Carinthia and Carniola, in the territory of Würzburg, in Westphalia, in the duchy of Cleves, and partially in the dioceses of Augsburg and Salzburg. Three excellent dukes of Bavaria, Albrecht V. (1550–1579), William V. (1579–98), and Maximilian, and the pious archduke Ferdinand of Styria were the chief promoters of the Catholic restoration in Germany and Austria. By the end of the century the destructive advance of Lutheranism and Calvinism stopped. The "Reformation had spent itself as a living force." "Zeal, devotion, learning, self-sacrifice, religious enthusiasm, were all on the side of the Church."

Thus the Catholic party was sufficiently strong under Rudolf II. to resist several daring attempts of the Calvinists to violate still further the Religious Peace of Augsburg. In 1583 Archbishop Gebhard of Koeln turned Calvinist and married an apostate nun, intending to change with the aid of the Palatine party the territory of his see into a Calvinist electorate. The Catholic chapter elected a new Archbishop, Ferdinand, brother of William of Bavaria. His loyal subjects and the troops of duke William cleared the territory of John Casimir's invading hordes, and forced the apostate to retire from public life. The Catholics were equally successful in vindicating their long invaded rights in Strassburg, Aachen, and other places.

429. **The Affair of Donauwoerth, 1606.** — The Palatine party had labored for a long time to organize a Calvinistic Union, but with scanty success. Donauwoerth, a small imperial town, gave them a means of agitation. In 1606 the annual procession on St. Mark's day was rudely disturbed by a fanatical mob. Catholic rights had been violated for many years. Rudolf II. threatened the town with the ban of the Empire, to be executed by Maximilian of Bavaria. The magistrates, after some blustering, submitted. But emissaries of the Palatine party induced them to defy the authority of the Emperor. Thereupon Maximillian took possession of the town, and restored the legal state of the Peace of Augsburg, expelling the Calvinist preachers, but guarding with scrupulous care the rights of the Lutheran citizens. Maximilian retained the city as security for the expenses which he had incurred by the expedition. The affair was distorted and magnified by the Palatine party for the purpose of gaining the cities for the contemplated Union.

430. The Diet of Ratisbon and the Evangelical Union, 1608. — The secession of the Calvinist party from the diet took place at Ratisbon, 1608. While the Catholic estates failed to pass a restitution clause, they were supported by the Lutheran party, in simply reaffirming the Religious Peace of Augsburg. The Palatine

party, on the other hand, demanded that they should be positively confirmed in the possession of stolen bishoprics and monasteries, that the Ecclesiastical Reservation be abolished, that the "right of reforming" be extended to the Calvinists, and that the majority decrees of the diet concerning religion and taxation should not be binding on the minority, — in other words, they said to the Catholics: "What we have taken from you we want to keep, and what you still possess we want to take." Neither Catholics nor Lutherans would listen to such demands. Accordingly the representatives of the Palatine party withdrew from the diet. Soon after, Frederic IV., elector Palatine, prince Christian of Anhalt, the duke of Würtemberg and three other princes met at Ahausen and founded the Evangelical Union for ten years, to obtain by force what the diets had refused to grant.

The chief promoters of the Union were Henry IV. of France, in his desire to destroy the House of Hapsburg, and his German confidant, the diplomatic Christian of Anhalt. Frederic IV. was chosen director for the next three years. The Union princes were to levy an army of mercenaries under a Union general, the conquests made were to be divided among the members in proportion to their contributions. The Union was Calvinistic in its nature; but to avoid quarrels with the Lutherans who were to be invited to join, they adopted the name Evangelical Union.

In the course of time it was joined by several imperial cities (Nürnberg, Ulm, Strassburg, 1615), and made offensive and defensive alliances with James I. of England (1612), and the United Provinces (1613); both Powers had to furnish money and troops. James I. married his daughter, princess Elizabeth, to Frederic V.

431. The Catholic Liga, 1609. — To counteract the revolutionary aims of the Union, Maximilian of Bavaria founded, 1609, a defensive Catholic Union, later called the Liga.

Maximilian was the most important Catholic prince of Germany, whose influence overbalanced that of the mightiest kings. Irreproachably pure in his private and public life, a devout Catholic, an accomplished scholar, he alone fully understood the dangers threatening the Empire, and combined far-sighted prudence with energy of action when the time for action arrived. By his excellent management he raised Bavaria to a high degree of financial and industrial prosperity and military efficiency.

The Liga was joined by the spiritual electors and a number of prince bishops and abbots. Maximilian was the head and com-

mander of the Liga, the Archbishop of Mainz his first assistant. The following year the Liga, which received subsidies from the Pope and Spain, set up an army of 15,000 foot and 4,000 horse. Henry IV. of France was just on the point of joining the Union forces with a powerful army to aid them in a quarrel concerning the succession in Jülich Cleves. The energetic measures of the Liga, and the assassination of Henry IV., prevented for the time being the outbreak of the great war.

432. **Contest of the Brothers — The Royal Charter.** — The Palatine party had been encouraged in its revolutionary attitude by serious quarrels between Rudolph II. and his brother Mathias. The Emperor, ruled by valets, astrologers and Jews, displayed signs of intermittent insanity, and persistently refused to regulate the succession. In order to provide for future eventualities, five archdukes of the House of Hapsburg in a family council signed an agreement by which archduke Mathias was acknowledged as the head of the family, 1606. No rebellion against the Emperor was intended by the signers.

Mathias himself, however, entered on the path of revolt. Supported by the provincial estates of Austria and Hungary, he invaded Bohemia, whose capital, Prague, Rudolf had chosen for his residence. In his fear and helplessness the Emperor agreed to cede Austria, Hungary and Moravia to Mathias, 1608. To maintain himself, Mathias had to make religious concessions to the Protestant estates of the ceded countries. Thereupon the estates of Bohemia threateningly demanded similar concessions from Rudolf II. Rudolf, as king of Bohemia, issued a Royal Charter (Majestaetsbrief), 1609, which granted freedom of conscience to all subjects, but the right of building churches only to the territorial lords of the three estates.

433. **Deposition of Rudolf — Coronation of Ferdinand.** — When Rudolf II. made arrangements to exclude Mathias from the succession in Bohemia, Mathias once more marched against Prague, and forced Rudolf to cede to him the rest of his possessions, 1611. Rudolf was kept a prisoner, and died of grief a few months later.

Mathias, already recognized by the estates as king of Bohemia, was now chosen Emperor by the electors, 1612. Owing his

authority to the revolt of the nobles, Mathias was as powerless as his predecessors. The Evangelical Union openly avowed its intention of transferring, at the next election, the imperial dignity to another House. To prevent the consummation of this plan, the childless Mathias adopted archduke Ferdinand of Styria, and proposed him as his successor to the Bohemian estates.

Ferdinand, a prince of sterling piety and scrupulous justice, was the most prominent living member of the House of Hapsburg. While he lacked the far-sightedness and energetic decision of Maximilian of Bavaria, he was prudent and cautious, and of a character not to be overawed by any personal danger in the discharge of his duty. In his own duchies he had restored the Catholic faith, as the Peace of Augsburg authorized him to do. He sent the preachers out of the country, pulled down a few churches, and re-established the priesthood without shedding a drop of blood. His chief fault was a lavish generosity to those who served him, so that his treasury was nearly always empty.

Notwithstanding some opposition, archduke Ferdinand was unanimously accepted as Bohemia's future king, and solemnly crowned with the crown of St. Wenzel, 1617. The following year he received the crown of St. Stephen in Pressburg, the capital of Hungary.

Onno Klopp: *Der Dreissigjährige Krieg*, vol. 1, pp. 1–227; *Tilly im 30-jähr. Krieg*, vol. 1, pp. 1–20. — A. Gindely: *History of the Thirty Years' War*, Part 1, ch. 1. — J. R. Gardiner: *The Thirty Years' War*, ch. 1; *Causes*, pp. 1–22. — *Beginnings of the Thirty Years' War:* M. v. 11, p. 291. — Ranke: *Times of Maximilian II.; of Ferdinand II. — Rudolf II.:* H. P. B., v. 50, p. 556. — H. O. Wakeman: *Europe, 1598–1715; Preliminary to the Thirty Years' War:* pp. 1–52. — Schmid: *Die deutsche Kaiser und Koenigswahl, 1588–1620:* H. J.-B., v. 6, 3, p. 161. — *Der 30-jährige Krieg:* Ursachen: Katholik, '82, 2. — *Zielpunkte:* Katholik, '65, 2, p. 671. — *Zur Vorgeschichte:* H. P. B., vol. 27, pp. 73, 153. — *Pfälzische Umtriebe gegen das Haus Oesterreich:* H. P. B., vol. 30, pp. 486, 509; Schreiber: *Maximilian I., Kurfürst von Bayern.*

§ 2.

THE BOHEMIAN AND PALATINE WARS.

434. The Outbreak. — The immediate occasion for the outbreak was furnished in Bohemia. Protestant subjects living under the jurisdiction of ecclesiastical lords, built two Protestant churches, one in the territory of the Archbishop of Prague, the other in that of the abbot of Braunau. In consequence of legal proceedings the former was demolished, the latter closed, 1618, as built in violation

of the Royal Charter (no. 432). Mathias, residing in Vienna, refused to listen to Protestant remonstrances, and upheld the decision of the local authorities. To render impossible a reconciliation between the king and the estates, count Thurn, the leader of the Protestant nobles resolved to murder the royal governors who were suspected, though wrongly, of having influenced the king in his decision. Accordingly on May 23, count Thurn and a small number of conspirators all armed, entered the castle of Prague, and after a bitter altercation dragged Martinez and Slawata, and the secretary Fabricius to the windows and hurled them seventy feet into the fosse below. By a wonderful preservation none of them was seriously hurt, but the signal for the great war was given.

435. Opening of Hostilities. — The authors of the crime organized a provisional government of thirty directors, ten from each estate, banished the Jesuits, and appointed Thurn commander of the army to be levied. The Bohemian nobles were but a faction fighting for license, plunder and power. Hence the people were as unwilling to fight as the rebel lords were to pay. It became necessary to engage mercenaries and pay them by forced loans. After repeated warnings Mathias sent 6,000 men under the Spanish general Buoquoi into Bohemia. Thereupon palsgrave Frederic V., head of the Union, reinforced the rebels with 2,000 men under the command of Ernest of Mansfeld, a deserter and adventurer, who soon came to be known as the "curse of Germany." Frederic was enabled to do so by Charles Emmanuel, duke of Savoy, an enemy of the Austro-Spanish House, who secretly furnished him commander and troops. The Silesians sent another 3,000 men. The United Netherland provinces paid monthly subsidies. Mansfeld took Pilsen, and reformed the city after the Calvinistic style. Towards the end of 1618, the Catholic city of Budweis with its garrison beleaguered by Thurn was the only place in Bohemia left to the Emperor. Whilst John George of Saxony tried to mediate, and Maximilian of Bavaria revived the Catholic Liga, Mathias died in March, 1619, and Ferdinand became king of Bohemia.

436. Progress of the Rebellion. — The Bohemian estates would not bow to the king whom they had chosen, and determined

to continue the war. The Protestant estates of Silesia and Lusatia entered into an armed confederation with Bohemia, while Moravia was revolutionized by an invasion of Thurn and joined the Bohemian league. In 1620 the league was joined by Hungary. Thurn then advanced to Vienna and occupied some suburbs.

Ferdinand was in the utmost danger. The Protestant Party in the city was powerful and threatening. Yet at this crisis of his life and of the fate of the Empire Ferdinand never faltered. Throwing himself before the crucifix, he found strength for the conflict into which he entered on behalf of his family, his Church, his country and his God. When a deputation of the Protestant estates entered his room unannounced, and with menacing rudeness demanded his permission to join the Bohemian Confederation, Ferdinand calmly refused to comply with their insulting request. The unexpected arrival of a cavalry regiment, the vanguard of reinforcements, induced the storming petitioners to slink from his presence. His heroic resolve not to leave Vienna in the hour of his greatest danger, saved the House of Hapsburg and the faith of his subjects, and roused the Catholic inhabitants to stand by Ferdinand.

Thurn, who had counted on treason within the city, finding himself disappointed, beat an inglorious retreat into Bohemia only to find that Mansfeld had been completely defeated by Buoquoi.

437. Election of Ferdinand II. and Frederic V. — The siege of Vienna being raised, Ferdinand repaired to the diet of Frankfort, where in the face of Palatine intrigues he was chosen Emperor by a unanimous vote (Aug. 28, 1619). Two days before a general diet of all the Bohemian crown lands had deposed Ferdinand; the Bohemian estates chose Frederic V. king of Bohemia. The youthful elector at first hesitated, but encouraged by his wife, Elizabeth of England, and the leaders of the Calvinistic party, he accepted the call as a "divine vocation." In Bohemia he soon became unpopular by his dissolute life and his forcible introduction of Calvinism.

438. Resources. — The Bohemian-Austrian-Hungarian Confederation and the Dutch subsidies were the only resources of Frederic for the defense of the Bohemian crown. For the defense of the Palatinate, the troops of the Union, which refused to take part in the Bohemian struggle, a Danish loan, and English alms were at his disposal.

Ferdinand succeeded in obtaining generous aid in money and troops from

Philip III. of Spain, who was guided by the thought of defending the Catholic cause. Maximilian, to whom Ferdinand intrusted the direction of all the coming operations, brought him the splendid and well-paid army of the Liga. The Emperor promised Maximilian the Palatine electorship, in case Frederic V. would be put under the ban of the Empire, and territorial securities for his expenses. Ferdinand gained also the co-operation of John George, elector of Saxony, by pledging himself not to disturb the possession of church lands in Saxony secularized since the Peace of Augsburg, *as long as their holders remained loyal subjects.* For this promise he had obtained the Pope's permission. Papal subsidies, auxiliaries from Poland and Tuscany, and the good will of France, added to his resources.

Tilly, to whom Maximilian intrusted the command of the Liguist troops, had earned his first laurels under Alexander of Parma. A conqueror in thirty-six battles, he was cautious in his plans, prompt in execution, and brave in the conflict. In all the dangers of camp and campaign he was a model of piety, chastity and temperance. His troops were the best disciplined in the war; his soldiers used to call him "Father John." In his campaigns in Protestant countries he used to protect Protestant churches with his own guard against any violation. He was undoubtedly the purest and noblest character in the tragedy of the Thirty Years' War.

439. Battle of the White Hill, 1620. — The campaign began in June, 1620. John George entered and subdued Lusatia in the name of Ferdinand. Spinola, the great Spanish general of the Netherlands, occupied the Palatinate on the left bank of the Rhine, and kept the Union army in check.

Lower Austria paid homage to Ferdinand in Vienna. Tilly invaded Upper Austria, which unconditionally submitted. Maximilian and Tilly now entered Bohemia, were joined by the forces of Buoquoi, and taking city after city marched upon Prague. The enemy was drawn up on a rising ground outside the walls, the White Hill. The army of the Liga, though weakened by sickness, with the war-cry "Sancta Maria" attacked the enemy, and routed them within an hour. Frederic, the "Winterking," fled for his life through Silesia and Germany and rested not till he found an asylum with Maurice of Nassau at the Hague, the capital of Holland.

440. Results of the Battle. — The results of the battle were the submission of Bohemia with its crownlands, the withdrawal of the Royal Charter of 1619, the restoration of the Catholic religion,

the recall of the Jesuits, the breaking up of the Evangelical Union, the proclamation of the ban against the "Winterking," the execution of twenty-seven insurrectionary leaders, and penal confiscations in proportion to the guilt of the rebels. Before another generation Bohemia was definitely ranged among the Catholic countries of Europe.

441. Mansfeld in the Palatinate — New Allies. The seat of war shifted from Bohemia to the Palatinate and surrounding countries. The fugitive Winterking could not be induced to renounce his pretensions to Bohemia. The conditions of peace which he proposed to Ferdinand were such as conquerors propose to the vanquished, including not only full indemnification for his Bohemian expenses, but a free gratuity in addition. The Dutch Republic, constantly stirring up enemies against the house of Hapsburg in Spain and Germany, encouraged him in this senseless policy.

The breaking up of the Union army peopled the camp of Mansfeld, who took up his position in the Upper Palatinate. His lawless troops became a terror to the country which they pretended to defend. Hence the magistrates of the towns made terms with Maximilian, and Mansfeld threw himself upon Alsace, and fortified Hagenau.

Frederic gained new allies. In the south, the margrave of Baden was arming for the Winterking; in the north, Christian of Brunswick, better known as Christian of Halberstadt. "Madcap Christian" had been made "bishop" of Halberstadt by a violation of the Peace of Augsburg and the profanation of sacred rites. He was a born fighter who loved war for the booty it offered, the misery it inflicted and the chance it afforded for burning and destroying. He had regular officers in his army called "brand masters."

Thus about 60,000 men were ready to fight for Frederic against the 70,000 of imperial, Liguist and Spanish troops. But Ferdinand's army was regularly cared for and paid, while Frederic's forces were obliged to depend on plunder.

442. The War. — The war began with the frightful devastation of the Catholic bishopric of Paderborn by Christian. In the summer of 1622, Mansfeld co-operating with the margrave of Baden and Christian of Brunswick, advanced to the recovery of the Lower Palatinate, but Tilly crushed the margrave in the murderous battle of Wimpfen, and Christian at Höchst on the Main. So great was the

panic caused by the battle of Höchst, that the margrave of Baden gave up the alliance, and the Winterking dismissed Mansfeld and Christian at their own request from his service. With the remnants of their army they retired into Lorraine, where they preyed upon the wretched inhabitants. Heidelberg and Mannheim surrendered to Tilly. The Dutch provinces, which since 1621 were again at open war with Spain after a twelve years' truce, summoned the brigand bands of Mansfeld and Christian to their aid. Christian suffered another crushing defeat at the hands of Tilly at Stadtlohn and fled to Paris, 1623. Mansfeld disbanded his troops and went to England. In 1624 no organized army stood against the Emperor. Ferdinand, meanwhile, with the consent of the diet, had transferred the electorship from the outlawed palsgrave to Maximilian of Bavaria as a life tenure, reserving the rights of Frederic's descendants. The new elector received the Upper Palatinate as security for his expenses.

Onno Klopp: *Dreissig-jähr. Krieg*, vol. 1, pp. 231–618; vol. 2, pp. 1–371; *Tilly:* vol. 1, pp. 22–203. — A. Gindely: *Hist. of the Thirty Years' War*, vol. 1, ch. 2–6; vol. 2, ch. 1–2.— S. R. Gardiner: *The Thirty Years' War*, ch. 2–4, pp. 23–65. — Wakeman: *Europe, 1598–1715*, pp. 53–67. — *Ferdinand II. and the Elector Frederick:* M. v. 11, p. 176; *Count von Tilly;* v. 11, pp. 453, 545. — E. Charvériat: *Les affaires religieuses en Bohème au 16ieme siècle.* — *Svoboda: Die Kirchenschliessung zu Klostergrab und Braunau und die Anfänge des 30j. Krieges:* I. K. Z., '86, p. 385. — D. Hurter: *Ferdinand II.* — Dudik: *Corresp. Ferd. II. mit seinen Beichtvätern.* — *Slawata und Martinez*, H. P. B., v. 44, pp. 117, 235. — *Böhmische Unruhen:* Kath. '63, 1, pp. 465, 575. — Reuss: *Graf Ernst v. Mansfeld, im böhmischen Kriege.* — Villermont: *Le comte de Tilly ou la guerre de trente ans; le comte de Mansfeld.*

§ 3.

THE DANISH WAR.

443. General Condition of Affairs. — The prospects of peace in 1624 were only apparent. The Protestant princes of northern Germany feared for their bishoprics. Louis XIII.'s friendly attitude towards Ferdinand II. changed, when Richelieu became his chief minister. Jean Armand du Plessis, Cardinal and duke of Richelieu, began his career as the all-powerful minister of Louis XIII. in 1624. He promised the king, that he would curb the insolence of the great, suppress the Huguenots as a political party, and make the name of Louis respected among the nations. He made his own the aim of Henry IV. permanently to weaken the House of Hapsburg. The United Provinces incessantly worked for the same purpose. James I. and his son Charles I., in view of the desperate position of the Winterking, and urged on by the clamor of the Protestant clergy, changed the policy of conciliation which they had hitherto adopted, into one of aggression. Christian IV.,

king of Denmark (1588–1648), as duke of Holstein a prince of the Lower Saxon circle, sought to secure some German bishoprics, dominion over the mouths of the German rivers, and the command of the North Sea. While his agents represented the conflict to the common people as a religious war, his own aim was chiefly conquest.

444. The Treaty of the Hague, 1625. — An alliance between Denmark, England, Holland and a number of the Lower Saxon princes was concluded at the Hague, December, 1625. Most of the Saxon princes were first won by a deception, Christian IV. pretending that it was necessary to defend the circle against Mansfeld. They still kept up professions of loyalty towards the Emperor. But when they recognized Christian IV., appointed commander-in-chief by the alliance, as their war lord, they ceased to be loyal subjects of the Empire. Jealousy of Denmark kept the Swedish king out of the alliance; loyalty, John George of Saxony. France did not openly join the league, but paid subsidies to the king of Denmark. In addition to the 30,000 foot and 8,000 horse commanded by Christian IV., Mansfeld, in the spring of 1625, had shipped an army from Dover, which, greatly suffering from want and disease, was reinforced by French enlistments and supported by French subsidies.

445. Wallenstein's Armament — Peace Negotiations. — To this coalition of foreign and domestic enemies the Emperor had now only the army of the Liga to oppose. Ferdinand's treasury was empty. In these straits Albert of Waldstein, or Wallenstein, as he is usually called, made him the offer of levying and supporting an army of at least 20,000 men on sufficient security. Ferdinand accepted the offer.

Wallenstein was born a Lutheran, of a very ancient but impoverished family. He joined the Catholic Church in his youth, traveled extensively, and served the House of Austria in several campaigns. By a rich marriage, and by buying up confiscated Bohemian estates at a nominal price, and improving them with extraordinary skill, he had become the richest landowner in Bohemia. The Emperor raised his joint possessions to the dignity of a feudal principality, and created him duke of Friedland. Wallenstein practiced the maxim that the war must support itself, not by the unlicensed brutality of a Mansfeld, but by requisitions couched in the form of law, and constantly increased the number of his army composed of troopers of every nation and creed. As commander, Wallenstein was slow and hesitating, consulted the stars before any important undertaking, but was a great strate-

gist; he struck a blow only when all the odds were in his favor. His boundless greed was equaled by his ambition. In the magnificence of his surroundings he vied with kings and Emperors.

In the autumn of 1625 Wallenstein occupied the bishoprics of Magdeburg and Halberstadt. During the winter peace negotiations were carried on between the Emperor and the Lower Saxon princes. The Protestants demanded that their rights to the confiscated bishoprics should be legally recognized. Ferdinand would not go beyond his former promise, not to disturb the holders by force of arms as long as they remained loyal subjects. He refused to acknowledge that robbery gave a lawful title to possession.

446. Campaign of 1626 — Battle at the Bridge of Dessau. — It was arranged by the Protestant leaders, that Mansfeld should chiefly operate against Wallenstein, Christian IV. against Tilly. Mansfeld met Wallenstein at the strongly fortified bridge of Dessau, spanning the Elbe (April 25). Dashing himself in vain against Wallenstein's fortifications, Mansfeld was routed by a brilliant counter-attack of the imperial army.

Mansfeld led his dispirited army through Silesia into Hungary intending to join Bethlen Gabor who had risen against the Emperor. Wallenstein followed him in an inner circle covering Vienna. Bethlen Gabor, too weak to cope with Wallenstein's numbers, sued for peace and obliged Mansfeld to leave Hungary. The great marauder who by his total want of morality and patriotism had been the worst foe to the peace of Germany, passed away on his way to Venice. Madcap Christian had died soon after the battle of Dessau.

447. Lutter am Barenberg. — Meanwhile the forces of the Liga under Tilly, reinforced by 8,000 men of Wallenstein's army, had achieved a still greater success on the Weser. Tilly overtook and defeated the Danes at Lutter. Christian IV. lost 8,000 on the field, 2,000 prisoners and all his artillery. Tilly then wintered on the Lower Elbe.

448. Campaigns of 1627 and 1628. — In the spring of 1627 Wallenstein cleared Silesia of the enemy and joined Tilly on the Lower Elbe, and drove the Danes into Holstein and Denmark itself. Separating again, Tilly occupied himself with besieging and taking Lower Saxon forts, while Wallenstein, by the end of the year, had conquered nearly all Holstein and Jutland.

Seeing the danger threatening him from Sweden, Wallenstein in 1628 threw garrisons into the towns of hostile Mecklenburg and Pomerania, to secure the coast of the Baltic. The dukes of Mecklenburg were placed under the ban of the Empire and Ferdinand bestowed their duchies on Wallenstein as security for his war-debt. Wallenstein now conceived the plan of creating a naval power by treaties with the Hansa towns. To gain a favorable position, he needed Stralsund. But the city offered stout resistance. Hitherto loyal, the citizens would rather throw up their allegiance to the Emperor than admit Wallenstein's soldiers within their walls. To protect themselves they called in Danish auxiliaries and a Swedish garrison, and Wallenstein had to raise the siege. His plan of founding a naval force for the Emperor thus came to naught.

449. The Peace of Lübeck, 1629. — Christian IV. after his heavy reverses was extremely anxious to obtain a peace, especially since Charles I., quarreling with his Parliament and at war with France, failed to pay the promised subsidies. The final terms offered by Wallenstein and Tilly were favorable enough. The Treaty was signed at Lübeck in June, 1629. Christian IV. received back all his hereditary possessions. He renounced for himself and his son all claims to the coveted German bishoprics and promised to meddle no further with German affairs.

450. Edict of Restitution, 1629. — Two months before this peace was signed, the Emperor had issued the Edict of Restitution, by which Protestant princes, in conformity with the Ecclesiastical Reservation clause were ordered to restore the bishoprics, monasteries and other church foundations seized in violation of the Religious Peace of Augsburg. The only exception made was in favor of John George of Saxony, on account of his constant loyalty.

There can be no question as to the legality of the measure. Ferdinand kept strictly within the Peace of Augsburg. But the measure was bound to rouse the most bitter opposition among the Protestants. Most of the property had been in their hands for two generations; new property claims had been formed in the course of time by transactions with persons who were innocent of the original robbery. Hence the Edict of Restitution was decried as a measure of oppression and persecution, and made a continuation of the war inevitable.

451. Diet of Ratisbon, 1630. — In 1630 the Emperor summoned a grand diet of princes to Ratisbon to settle a number of pressing questions. The diet was attended by the Emperor, the Catholic electors, ambassadors of the Protestant electors, of the Winterking, and by Papal, Spanish, French and English envoys. The removal of Wallenstein was the one point in which all the members of the diet, and all the foreign representatives, except the Spaniards, agreed. Maximilian of Bavaria, who was influenced by the shrewd Father Joseph, a Capuchin, whom Richelieu used to employ as his diplomatic agent, headed the opposition to Wallenstein.

Since 1626 numerous complaints, remonstrances and deputations, concerning Wallenstein, had been sent to the Emperor. Wallenstein was charged with trying to prolong the war by his inactivity, with endless extortions inflicted on friends and foes alike, with the intention of starving out and breaking up the army of the Liga, with carrying his enlistments beyond all reasonable bounds (his army now numbered over 100,000 men) in order to establish the Empire on a new basis of military power and making himself the dictator of Germany.

After lengthy deliberations between the diet and the Emperor, the agreement was reached that Wallenstein should be dismissed, a number of regiments should be disbanded, and the Imperial and Liguist troops be united and commanded by Tilly with restricted powers, and supported by the diets of the circles. As to the revocation of the Edict of Restitution, and the restoration of the dukes of Mecklenburg demanded by the two Protestant electors, no definite conclusion was reached; but the further operation of the Edict was suspended for a year, and the Mecklenburg question referred to the courts. The diet finally refused to comply with the Emperor's wish to have his son Ferdinand, king of Hungary, chosen king of the Romans. Wallenstein retired into private life, setting up a kingly household in his duchy of Friedland, and brooding over revenge.

Onno Klopp: *Thirty Years' War*, vol. 2, pp. 375–853; vol. 3, part 1, pp. 1–334; *Tilly*, vol. 1, pp. 204–518; vol. 2, pp. 1–104. — Gindely: *Hist., etc.*, vol. 2, ch. 2–4. — Gardiner: ch. 3–7, pp. 65–127. — Wakeman: pp. 66–81. — *Richelieu and Father Joseph*, Q. R. '96, 2, p. 339.— Gustave Fagniez: *Le Père Joseph et Richelieu.* — *Ferdinand II. and Wallenstein*, M., v. 9, pp. 24, 144. — A. Charvériat: *Histoire de le guerre de trente ans.* — Gindely: *Wallenstein während seines ersten Generalats.* — Lichtenstein: *Die Schlacht bei Lutter a. B.*— Opel: *Der niedersächsisch-dänische Krieg.* — Slangen-Schlegel: *Geschichte Christians IV.*— *Tilly*, H. P. B.; vol. 44, p. 846; vol. 48, pp. 705, 823. — *Wallenstein:* H. P. B., vol. 109. pp. 233, 332, 389. — Sidgwick: *Story of Denmark.* — Mitchell: *Life of Wallenstein.* — Aretin: *Wallenstein.*— Ranke: *Hist. of Wallenstein.*

§ 4.

GUSTAVUS ADOLPHUS IN GERMANY, 1630–32.

452. The House of Wasa.



453. Sweden before the Thirty Years' War. — Eric either through passion or insanity plunged his country into a fraternal war, and was deposed by the estates of the kingdom (1569), and kept in confinement till his death (1578). His brother John, succeeding him in 1569, favored a Catholic reaction, and was received into the Church. The people, still Catholic at heart, made no opposition. Charles, the youngest of the three brothers, placed himself at the head of the Protestant party. While John, in the latter part of his reign, abandoned the Catholic faith, his son Sigismund, a zealous Catholic, was chosen king of Poland, 1587. When Sigismund, a considerable time after the death of his father John, arrived in Sweden to take lawful possession of his kingdom, he found the Protestant party in power, and was not even able to obtain freedom of worship for his Catholic co-religionists. After his coronation and departure for Poland, his uncle Charles usurped the royal power, maintained it in a war with Sigismund, and was declared by the estates hereditary king of Sweden, 1599. While the persecuting policy of Charles firmly established Protestantism in Sweden, his nephew Sigismund, aided by the labors of the Society of Jesus, strengthened Poland in the Catholic faith.

454. Gustavus Adolphus, 1611–32. — Gustavus Adolphus inherited from his father wars with Denmark, Russia and Poland. He made peace with Denmark in 1613, with Russia 1617, and pursued the war with Poland with great success, so that nearly all the coast provinces of the Baltic,

belonging to Poland and Russia, came into his possession. Since the beginning of the Thirty Years' War Gustavus II. was watching for an opportunity to enter the struggle as the independent leader of a Protestant army. In 1626 he took the town and harbor of Pillau, in ducal Prussia, without a declaration of war. In 1628 Stralsund opened its gates to his garrison. His own safety was bound up with Protestantism, as it was only the strength of Protestantism which secured him against the just hereditary claims of his cousin, the Catholic king of Poland. To extend his dominion to both shores of the Baltic, to weld the Protestant territories of Germany into a Corpus Evangelicum under his leadership, to subject the Catholic territories of Middle Germany to his own scepter and thus to found a great Protestant Empire of the North, was the dream of his soaring ambition. During his reign Catholicity in Sweden was punished with death. With Gustavus Adolphus, a military genius of the first order, an experienced, brave and unscrupulous conqueror entered on the scene of the German war, who gained the common people by his personal affability and his ostentatious Protestantism, while he bent the Protestant princes to his will by his indomitable energy.

455. Landing of Gustavus Adolphus. — In July, 1630, while the diet of Ratisbon was still in session, Gustavus Adolphus, at the head of 12,000 tried soldiers, landed without a declaration of war on the coast of Pomerania which Wallenstein had left without protection; 30,000 more stood ready as a reserve in Sweden. The king forced the aged duke of Pomerania to sign a treaty which gave Pomerania forever into the power of Sweden at the expense of the lawful heir, the elector of Brandenburg. The conqueror spent the rest of the year in clearing the fortified places of Pomerania and Mecklenburg of Wallenstein's garrisons.

456. Meeting of Leipsic. — The Protestant princes met in September at Leipsic, effected a union under John George, elector of Saxony, demanded from the Emperor the withdrawal of the Edict of Restitution, and resolved to bring about extensive armaments, for the purpose of excluding both friends and foes from their territories. Whilst the princes still refused to treat with Gustavus Adolphus, their measures paralyzed the Catholic forces and prepared the way for a future alliance with Sweden.

457. Treaty of Bärwalde — Spring Campaign of 1631. — Richelieu, in his efforts to bring about a new confederation uniting Sweden, England, France, Holland, and the German Protestants against the House of Hapsburg in Austria and Spain, concluded in January, 1631, with Gustavus, the Treaty of Bärwalde, by which

France was to pay an annual subsidy of 1,000,000 francs to the king of Sweden. The larger confederation was effected the following year. Tilly opened the campaign in spring. His plan was to force the Swedes to a decisive battle, Gustavus' plan, to tire out Tilly's army by marches and countermarches. New Brandenburg, taken by the Swedes, was retaken by Tilly. Called away, however, by Maximilian to join general Pappenheim in the siege of Magdeburg, Tilly had to give free scope to Gustavus, who captured Frankfurt on the Oder. Magdeburg was, at this stage of the war, the most important fortress by its strength and position. The city had raised the standard of rebellion independently of the Protestant princes. Gustavus declared that he would march to her relief, if supported by the two Protestant electors. He succeeded, indeed, in compelling the elector of Brandenburg to open the fortress of Spandau to his soldiers, but John George of Saxony still refused to join the foreigner. Consequently the king of Sweden left Magdeburg to the fate which his agents were preparing for it.

458. The Siege of Magdeburg. — The city council of Magdeburg had received an agent of Gustavus Adolphus, and overawed by the populace, had signed a treaty, by which they obliged themselves to admit within the walls the king, his officers, and a body guard of 800 men. His army, however, would have to camp outside the walls. The treaty expressly relieved the city from all contributions to the war. The king promised that he would hasten to the relief of the city, if attacked on his account. Gustavus then sent his marshal, colonel Falkenberg, to Magdeburg to have the supreme direction of the defense. Tilly's besieging army gradually rose to 30,000 men.

459. The Fall of Magdeburg. — Pappenheim stormed the city on May 20, after a siege of several months. The right of war then existing allowed three hours for the sacking of a city which had refused an offer of capitulation. Tilly, according to his wont, had three times offered terms of capitulation. Scarcely had the first rush over the walls taken place, and Tilly had hastened to Pappenheim's assistance, when the principal street was set on fire at more than twelve points by the Swedish party; the powder trains laid by the defenders beneath the houses took fire, and in a short time the conflagration broke forth in fifty places all over the city where no imperial soldier had set his foot. The greatest part

of Magdeburg sank into soot and ashes. The Cathedral, the monastery of our Lady and a number of houses with some thousands of people who had taken refuge in them, were saved by the almost superhuman efforts of Tilly. That he could not prevent the atrocities of the soldiers infuriated by the bitter and useless resistance which they encountered after the taking of the city, is evident, but he cut down the time of the sacking to an hour and a half. The evidence that the defenders of Magdeburg themselves caused the destruction of the city, is overwhelming. All the eye-witnesses of the catastrophe agree in this point. Falkenberg, a marshal of Gustavus Adolphus, had the supreme direction of the defense. He had left the weaker part of the city practically undefended. He had surrendered strong forts without necessity. He had secretly removed all the gunpowder from the arsenal to fill his subterranean mines. Tilly had nothing to gain by the destruction of Magdeburg; he had everything to gain by saving it as a basis for his future operations.

It may be doubtful, whether Falkenberg acted on his own responsibility for the king of Sweden, or in consequence of an understanding with him, but the advantage was entirely on the king's side. Magdeburg in his hands was of little use, considering the treaty which he had concluded with the city; Magdeburg uninjured in Tilly's hand would have proved an almost insurmountable obstacle in his way; Magdeburg destroyed and the blame fastened on Tilly, as the Swedish king did fasten it on him against his better knowledge, became a firebrand in his hand, to rouse the Protestants of Germany against the Catholics.

460. Battle of Breitenfeld Near Leipsic. — Gustavus Adolphus now compelled the elector of Brandenburg at the cannon's mouth, to place his country, his fortresses and his army at his disposal. Thus reinforced, he took an unassailable position on the Elbe, where William of Hesse and Bernard of Weimar were the first German princes to join him voluntarily. Tilly, meanwhile, by the Emperor's order, had called on the elector of Saxony, either to disband his army or to join in the war against the foreign invader. John George threw himself into the arms of the Swede, and added 10,000 men to his forces. Tilly had just seized Leipsic, when he saw himself confronted by the superior numbers of the enemy at Breitenfeld, the "broad field" of Leipsic. Pappenheim's impetuosity of attack forced him to give up his strong position and take

part in the fight. The result was that though the Saxon rebels were routed, yet Tilly saw himself outgeneraled by Gustavus and was defeated after a fiercely contested battle.

The battle of Breitenfeld at one blow destroyed the work of the last ten years. It crippled the imperial power, rent asunder Germany's political unity, and destroyed her national spirit by making a foreign king, paid by another foreign king, the hero of the Protestant half of the country.

461. The Triumphs of Gustavus Adolphus, 1631, and Spring, 1632. — While John George of Saxony entered Bohemia and took Prague, the victor of Breitenfeld removed the administrators appointed under the Edict of Restitution in the north, and threw himself on the rich spiritual territories on the Main and Middle Rhine, took Halle, Erfurt, Würzburg, Frankfort, Oppenheim, Mainz and other places. In the storming of the citadel of Würzburg, soldiers, women, children, priests and monks were indiscriminately slaughtered. Libraries, works of art, sacred vessels and vestments, treasures of every kind were sent to Sweden. The soldiery reveled in the wines and luxuries of the Rhenish provinces. The king, in pursuit of his dream of an Empire, changed the spiritual territories into his "Duchy of Franconia." The magistrates and people in the bishoprics of Magdeburg and Würzburg, in the city of Frankfort, as subsequently in Bamberg and Augsburg, were compelled to take the oath of allegiance to the crown of Sweden, acknowledging Gustavus Adolphus and his heirs as the sole and hereditary sovereigns of the conquered land. The monasteries were secularized and bestowed on Swedish generals and German adherents. To gain over the Protestant princes, Gustavus Adolphus was lavish in distributing territorial grants, sometimes promising the same territory to two or three applicants.

462. Gustavus Adolphus in Bavaria, 1632. — In the spring of 1632 Bamberg was taken by the Swedes and retaken by Tilly; Nürnberg opened her gates to the king, and Donauwoerth was stormed after a stout resistance. On the Lech, not far from its mouth, Gustavus encountered and defeated Tilly a second time. Here the Catholic hero, betrayed and left to his fate by the reappointed Wallenstein, received his mortal wound. The retreating

army carried their leader to Ingolstadt, where he directed from his sick bed the successful defense of the city against the Swedes, and died twelve days after the Battle on the Lech. The main army of the Swedes, after crossing the Lech, overran Bavaria. In Munich Gustavus captured the art treasures of the German Athens, and the arsenal of Maximilian. Munich had to pay 300,000 thalers contribution to escape a Swedish sacking.

463. Wallenstein's Second Army. — All Germany was now at the feet of Gustavus, save the Austrian countries. Wallenstein, who had carried on secret negotiations with Gustavus and Richelieu, seemed to be the only man to save the tottering Empire. The Emperor invariably trusted him; Spain urged, and Maximilian of Bavaria fully accepted his reappointment, apologizing to him for his former opposition. Wallenstein undertook the enlistment. From all sides officers and soldiers gathered around the standard of the "Duke of Friedland," men who owed no allegiance to the Emperor and recognized no lord but Wallenstein. Having organized the army, Wallenstein could be induced to accept the command only upon the most exorbitant conditions which a subject ever offered to his sovereign. His control of all the armies in the field was to be unconditional; the Emperor himself could not issue any order to him through any other officer; Wallenstein alone was to exercise the right of pardon and punishment in the whole Empire. He was to be rewarded with adequate territorial possessions and an elector's hat.

464. Wallenstein's Campaign — The Battle of Lützen. — Wallenstein first cleared Bohemia of the enemy. Then taking position at Eger and threatening to cut off the retreat of the Swedes, he forced the enemy to evacuate Bavaria. Gustavus occupied a fortified camp at Nürnberg. Wallenstein set up his camp opposite him in a way which enabled him to cut off supplies both from the city and the Swedish camp. For ten weeks the leaders faced each other, neither caring to attack. Gustavus at last made an assault upon Wallenstein's entrenchments but was repulsed with great loss. He then struck his tents, and marched to the Danube to entice Wallenstein to follow him. But Wallenstein threw himself on Saxony and

the Swedish king had to come to the aid of his ally. Wallenstein had just sent away Pappenheim to relieve Koeln, besieged by the enemy, when Gustavus approached to give battle. In this Battle of Lützen the Swedish conqueror fell mortally wounded; Pappenheim, hastily recalled, was killed whilst vainly endeavoring to meet Gustavus Adolphus face to face. Bernard of Weimar, commanding after the king's death, kept up the fight till nightfall. The Imperialists, short of provisions, withdrew to Leipsic. The Swedes were in possession of the battlefield till morning and on this account claimed the victory of Lützen.

Onno Klopp: *30j. Krieg*, vol. 3, p. 1, pp. 337–628; vol. 3, part 2, pp. 1–632; *Tilly:* vol. 2, pp. 105–454. — Gindely: *History*, vol. 2, ch. 5–7. — Gardiner: ch. 7 and 8, pp. 127–162. — Wakeman: pp. 81–99. — R. Parsons: *Gustavus Adolphus:* A. C. Q., v. 20, p. 510. — *Schweden's Verhältniss zum röm. Stuhl unter Johann III., Sigismund III. and Karl IX.:* H. P. B., v. 2, p. 33. — Caro: *Gesch. Polens.* — Geiger: *Gesch. von Schweden.* — Hess: *Gottfried Heinrich Graf zu Pappenheim.* — Hoffman: *Gesch. der Stadt Magdeburg.* — Cranholm-Helms: *Gustav II. Adolph in Deutschland.* — Gfrörer; Droyson: *Gustav Adolph.* — Gindely: *Waldstein's Vertrag mit d. Kaiser bei Übername des zweiten Generalats.* — *Lives of Gustavus Adolphus by*: Abelous, (French), Dodge, Fletcher, Harte; French: *Gustavus Adolphus in Germany.* — Opitz: *Die Schlacht bei Breitenfeld.* — *On Gustavus Adolphus' relation to Germany:* Katholik, '76, 2, p. 170. — *On Tilly, Magdeburg and G. Adolphus:* H. P. B., v. 46, pp. 845, 913; vol. 47, pp. 72, 93, 193, 245. — *On Magdeburg's destruction:* Kath., '67, 2, p. 715; H. P. B., v. 35, p. 129. — *On his death:* Kath., '90, 2, 313.

§ 5.

SWEDISH WAR AFTER THE DEATH OF GUSTAVUS ADOLPHUS.

465. The League of Heilbronn. — In Sweden, Christina, the infant daughter of Gustavus Adolphus, succeeded to the throne. The regency was in the hands of the chancellor Oxenstyerna, whose greed now took the place of Gustavus' soaring ambition. To come out of the war with as much money as possible and the possession of Pomerania and Magdeburg, was the aim of his policy. The army was commanded by able leaders, Bernard of Weimar, the cautious general Horn, Baner, etc. In the spring of 1633, the four circles of Suabia, Franconia and the Upper and Lower Rhine, and the two Saxon circles, formed with Sweden the League of Heilbronn, by which Sweden was intrusted with the supreme direction of the war. John George of Saxony did not join this league. Richelieu, who con-

tinued to pay his annual subsidies, became a party to the League of Heilbronn, and thus securing a claim to interfere in Germany, completely sacrificed the Catholic interests of Germany to his policy of aggrandizement. To satisfy the clamor of the unpaid officers, Bernard of Weimar was given the new duchy of Franconia, while lands worth millions of florins, taken from the Catholic estates, were distributed among the other officers.

466. Wallenstein's Treason and Death. — After the Battle of Lützen, Wallenstein withdrew into Bohemia, and opened negotiations with the electors of Saxony and Brandenburg, with Oxenstyerna and Bernard of Weimar, and with Richelieu, to force a peace, which at the expense of the Empire would secure his own advantage. In his negotiations with France and the Bohemian exiles, he offered to abandon the Emperor, if he would receive the crown of Bohemia. Though at the head of 50,000 men, Wallenstein all but ceased to operate against the enemy, concluded armistices, allowed Bernard of Weimar to take and keep Ratisbon, and repeatedly defied the orders of the Emperor. His loyalty became more and more an object of suspicion. The affair of Pilsen, where a number of high officers bound themselves by their signatures to follow Wallenstein wherever he would lead them, put an end to all hesitation in Vienna. The Emperor took steps to secure the loyalty of the commanding officers and the army. In February, 1634, an imperial patent publicly charged Wallenstein and his adherents with high treason, and ordered the army to obey Gallas, Piccolomini and other loyal generals. When Wallenstein saw that the majority of the army would remain loyal to the Emperor, he marched with a small detachment to Eger to join the Swedes approaching under Bernard of Weimar. There a few officers, Gordon, Butler and Leslie resolved to prevent the accomplishment of Wallenstein's treason by slaying him and his chief supporters. The proposal to make them prisoners, was, in view of the approaching enemy, rejected as practically impossible. The leading conspirators were slain at a banquet in the castle of Eger, while Wallenstein himself was pierced with a halberd by captain Devereux of the Irish dragoons at his lodgings in the town.

The Emperor had not given any instructions for the capture of the person of Wallenstein, much less did he order his murder. He was deeply affected when he heard of Wallenstein's death. By attempting to force his sovereign to an unfavorable peace with the help of the enemy, Wallenstein had placed himself beyond the pale of the law.

467. The Battle of Nördlingen, 1634. — Wallenstein's army was reorganized, and placed under the command of the Emperor's son, Ferdinand, already crowned king of Hungary, assisted by general Gallas. The Imperialists made rapid progress. Ratisbon surrendered, Donauwoerth was stormed, Nördlingen besieged. Here Bernard of Weimar and general Horn attacked the imperial and Bavarian forces reinforced by a Spanish army, but they were so signally defeated, that Horn became a prisoner, and Bernard fled, leaving 10,000 of his men on the field, and 6,000 prisoners in the hands of the victors. Bernard's duchy of Franconia became a thing of the past. Before the spring of 1635, nearly all southern Germany was reconquered or pacified. The remaining members of the League of Heilbronn became mere vassals of France, fighting for French pay, and promising not to treat with the Emperor without the permission of France.

468. The Peace of Prague, 1635. — John George, who had grown disgusted both with the Swedish alliance and the new treason of the Heilbronn leaguers, manifested his desire for peace, and Ferdinand II. showed his willingness to make concessions. Thus the Peace of Prague was concluded between the Emperor and the elector of Saxony, as a basis of reconciliation for all who would accept it. The most important stipulation was, that while the Ecclesiastical Reservation was to be maintained, Protestant estates in possession of church lands in 1627 could retain them for the next forty years. This clause practically meant the abandonment of the Edict of Restitution. The Emperor worked for the peace among the Catholic, John George among the Protestant estates. Before the end of the year the elector of Brandenburg and nearly all the more prominent princes and imperial cities acceded to the peace, ready to aid the Emperor in his warfare against the Swedish invaders. Only the few actual adherents of Richelieu and Oxenstyerna (Würtemberg, Baden,

Hesse, and Bernard of Weimar) were excluded from the peace and amnesty.

Onno Klopp, vol. 3, part 2, pp. 832–855. — A. Gindely: vol. 3, ch. 1-2. — Wakeman (Periods of European History), pp. 100–104. — Gardiner: pp. 163–183. — A. Charvériat: *Histoire de la guerre de trente ans.* — F. W. Barthold: *Gesch. des grossen deutschen Krieges vom Tode Gustav Adolfs.* — R. Caldwell: *Ferdinand II. and Wallenstein,* M. '76, 3, pp. 24, 144. — Aretin: *Wallenstein.* — Mitchell: *Life of Wallenstein.* — Duhr, S. J.: *Zur Wallenstein Literatur,* St. v. 40, p. 63; *Wallenstein's Schuld,* pp. 195, 303. — Hildebrand: *Wallenstein und seine Verbindungen mit den Schweden.* — Förster: *Wallenstein's Briefe.* — Fr. v. Hurter: *Wallenstein's vier letzte Lebensjahre.* — Hallowich: *Wallenstein's Ende.* — *Wallenstein's Tod:* H. P. B., v. 14, p. 603. — *On Christina of Sweden:* H. P. B. vol. 12, pp. 20, 65, 141, 235. — A. Huber: *Gesch. Oesterreichs.*

§ 6.

THE AGGRANDIZEMENT OF FRANCE AND THE FRANCO-SWEDISH PERIOD OF THE WAR.

469. Cardinal Richelieu and His Enemies. — The indomitable courage, quick decision, inflexible will, and freedom from any political scruples, which Richelieu brought to the service of Louis XIII., made France the first power in Europe. The suppression of the last Huguenot rising (no. 498) gave the kingdom religious peace. His colonial policy extended the boundaries of French possessions and promoted the spread of the Catholic faith among the savage tribes of New France. His promotion of science and arts nourished the germs of the artistic and literary excellence which was to adorn the reign of Louis XIV. Having once obtained the full confidence of the king, the great minister removed the two sore spots on the face of the realm, the national disintegration brought about by the Huguenot wars, and the anarchical tendency of the higher nobility. Dueling was declared punishable by death. All fortifications of towns and castles not needed for the defense of the frontiers were razed to the ground. Feudal levies were replaced by a professional army. This attack on the chief privileges of the nobility caused conspiracy after conspiracy against the minister, in which princes of the blood, especially Gaston of Orleans, the king's brother, were implicated. Richelieu crushed them with merciless severity. The comtes de Chalais and Montmorency (1627), the marshal de Marillac (1630), the marshal de Montmorency (1632), Cinque-Mars (1642), altogether five dukes, four counts, two marshals and many other nobles, died on the scaffold, whilst other members of the nobility or gentry were sent to the galleys, imprisoned or exiled. The duke of Lorraine, who had allied himself with the enemy against the Cardinal, had to flee, and Lorraine was overrun and occupied by 25,000 French men under the king himself. Gaston saved his head only by betraying his army and the queen-mother, Marie de' Medici, who died in exile at Koeln, 1642.

470. Administrative Changes. — It was not personal vindictiveness which inspired this policy, but the stern resolve to concentrate all political power in the crown. For this purpose the Cardinal replaced the governors of provinces who had assumed almost sovereign and hereditary power during the civil wars, by men devoted to the king and to himself. He appointed "Intendants" chosen from the middle classes, invested with great powers but removable at the king's will and therefore bound to him by their own interests. While he respected the prestige of the nobility as a class, he stripped them of political power and admitted them to positions of rank and emolument only as officers of the crown. He promptly annulled the charters and ancient privileges of the municipalities, as soon as these grew discontented or restless. He gradually abolished the Provincial States, and completely ignored the States General. In 1614 they had met for the last time before the French Revolution. Even the clergy had to feel the strong hand of the minister in matters of taxation, immunities and jurisdiction under the ordinances of the Cardinal, issued without consulting Rome. His hardest struggle, lasting fourteen years, was with the Parliament of Paris which had gradually assumed the management of political affairs and the duties of the States General. In his declaration of 1641, Richelieu excluded the Parliament from all state affairs, confined its remonstrances to mere matters of finance, compelled it to register royal decrees without deliberation and suppressed the most influential officers connected with this body. Richelieu died in 1642. The death of the king followed close upon the death of the minister. Louis XIII. owes the greatness of his reign to the tact and fidelity with which he supported Richelieu against all his enemies. Anne of Austria, the queen-widow, assumed the government for the boy-king Louis XIV.

471. France in the Thirty Years' War. — The Battle of Nördlingen, which divided Germany into a loyal and disloyal rather than a Catholic and Protestant part, put the German rebels at the feet of Richelieu. The war became primarily a war between the House of Bourbon and the House of Hapsburg in Austria and Spain. As protector and director of what remained of the League of Heilbronn, Richelieu appointed Bernard of Weimar a marshal of France, subject to the sole command of Louis XIII., and formally declared war against Spain in 1635. A French army was to join the forces of the prince of Orange in order to drive the Spaniards from the Netherlands. The conquests were to be divided between France and the United Provinces. A second army was to operate in Italy against Milan and the Spanish possessions. Bernard of Weimar received annually 3,000,000 francs to support a German army of 10,000 men

operating in Germany. After a few years of failure he conquered the fortresses on the Upper Rhine (Rheinfelden, Freiburg, Breisach) and the greater part of Alsace, 1638–39. A serious quarrel between Richelieu and Bernard about the division of the spoils was cut short by Bernard's sudden death in 1639. Both his army and the conquered territory passed into the hands of France. Alsace and Lorraine were henceforth ruled by French governors. Bernard's army, however, under the command of French generals, was subsequently annihilated at Tuttlingen by imperial and Bavarian troops, 1643.

472. The Campaign in the Netherlands. — The second plan of Richelieu, the expulsion of the Spaniards from the Netherlands, failed. The enthusiasm of the Catholic Netherlanders foiled all the attempts of the prince of Orange and his French allies to dispossess the Spaniards. Not only had the French troops to withdraw from the Low Country, but France had to undergo a new armament to throw back a Spanish invasion across the borders. But in 1639 the Spanish fleet was defeated in the Downs by the Dutch, and in 1643 a Spanish army was nearly destroyed by the French at Rocroy. This victory, won by the young duke of Enghien, better known as the prince of Condé, made France the first military power of Europe.

473. The Swedish Campaign. — The Swedes won their first decisive advantage after their rout at Nördlingen in the bloody battle of Wittstock, in which Baner inflicted the heaviest defeat of the war on the united imperial and Saxon armies, 1636. Famine, pestilence and the Swedes reduced Saxony to a desert. In 1637 Baner was driven back to the shores of the Baltic. He again broke from his retreat (1638) and fought his way into Bohemia (1639). Thence dislodged by the imperialists he was forced to fall back on Halberstadt, where he died of the effects of revelling and campaigning, 1641.

474. Character of the War. — Horrible as the war had been from its commencement, it was every day assuming a more horrible character. On both sides all traces of discipline had vanished in the dealings of the armies with the inhabitants of the countries in which they were quartered. The Swedes, however, outstripped all others in fiendish excesses. Their cruelty became a bye-word in Germany. "He who had money," says a contemporary, "was their enemy; he who had none, was tortured because he had it not."

Outrages of unspeakable atrocities were committed everywhere. Human beings were burned with firebrands, their flesh pierced with needles, or cut to the bone with saws, all to make them reveal where they had concealed their money. Others were scalded with boiling water or hunted with fierce dogs. What the raiders could not take along, they destroyed. The horrors of a town taken by storm were repeated day by day in the open country. (Gardiner.)

475. Succession of Ferdinand III., 1637–1657. — Ferdinand II. died 1637, and was succeeded by his son, Ferdinand III., king of Hungary, who the year before had been chosen king of the Romans. His election had been made conditional on his signing the agreement, that no Emperor could henceforth decree the ban of the Empire without the concurrence of the electors. Ferdinand III. resembled his father in his Catholic piety, the purity of his family life, and his sincere desire for peace. In the choice of his advisers he was more fortunate than Ferdinand II., and by putting an end to his father's unreasonable expenditures, he greatly improved the financial administration of the government. His economy alone enabled him to continue a war, which was brutally forced upon him by France and Sweden.

476. Swedish Campaign under Torstenson. — While the preliminaries of peace were discussed at Hamburg, Osnabrück and Münster, the paralyzed general Torstenson, Baner's successor, directing the battles from his litter, astonished his enemies by the rapidity of his movements, defeated the imperial army in the second Battle of Breitenfeld (1642), overran Bohemia, Silesia and Moravia, hurried back to the north and vanquished the Danes, who, alarmed at the growing power of Sweden, had declared war, marched again into Bohemia, gained the battle of Jankau (1645), reduced the kingdom to another desert, and threatened Vienna. Pestilence in his army, and his growing disease made him lay down the command, 1641–45.

477. The French and Swedes United. — Wrangel, Torstenson's successor, harassed Bavaria (1647), and the following year concentrated his forces in the center of Germany and effected a junction with the French army under Turenne. They undertook an invasion of Bavaria, expelled Maximilian, and reduced the country to the state of Saxony and Bohemia. Part of the army proceeded to Bohemia. The last action of the war was the defense of the main

city of Prague by all classes of the population, after the Kleinseite, a fortified suburb of the capital, had been taken by a stratagem of the Swedes. The assailants, after a loss of 5,000 men, were interrupted in their operations by the news that the general Peace of Westphalia had been signed at Osnabrück and Münster. Thus the war ended where it had begun.

Gardiner: *Rise of Richelieu*, pp. 70–75; *The Preponderance of France*, pp. 184–208. — A. Gindely: ch. 3–5. — Wakeman: *The Aggrandizement of France — France under Richelieu*, 105–117. — Pardoe: *Marie de Medici.* — Döllinger: *Studies in European History.* — *Lives of Richelieu* by Robson, Lodge, Masson, James, Lord. — Topin: *Louis XIII. et Richelieu — Mémoires du Cardinal de Richelieu.* — M. l'abbé de St. Pierre: *Testament politique du Cardinal de Richelieu.* — Dussiaux: *Le Cardinal de Richelieu; Etudè biographique.* — Smith: *Age of Richelieu.* — Stanhope: *Life of Condé.* — Hozier: Turenne: *France under Richelieu*, Q. R. '84, 4. — Vicomte d'Avenel: *Richelieu et la Monarchie absolue.* — Picot: *Hist. des Etats Généraux (1365-1614).* — *Early Days of the Paris Police:* M., v. 6, pp. 2, 225, 324, 423. — *Ferdinand III.:* H. P. B., v. 57, pp. 200, 280. — Bougeant, S. J.: *Histoire des Guerres et des Négociations qui précédèrent le Traité de Westphalie.* — Charvériat: *Hist. de la guerre de trente ans.* — Sidgwick: *Denmark.* — Geijer: *Sweden.* — H. v. Egloffsheim: *Bayerns Friedenspolitik, 1645-1647.* — Gindely: *Archivalische Forschungen zur Gesch. des 30-jahr Krieges.* — R. Parsons: *Pope Urban VIII.; The Thirty Years' War;* Studies; vol. 4, p. 48.

§ 7.

THE PEACE OF WESTPHALIA.

The stipulations of the Peace of Westphalia apart from the money indemnifications were as follows:—

478. Territorial and International Clauses. — (a) France obtained the perpetual possession of Metz, Toul and Verdun, Alsace with its ten imperial cities, the fortress of Breisach, free of any feudal obligation, and Pignerol in the Italian Alps.

Through the possession of Breisach and Pignerol, France had henceforth free access to Germany and Italy.

(b) Sweden received western and part of eastern Pomerania, a number of islands and parts of Mecklenburg, Bremen and Verden, as feudal tenures. Brandenburg and other states, affected by the territorial grants to Sweden, were indemnified by bishoprics and abbeys secularized before 1624.

Sweden, by her German acquisitions, gained control of the mouths of the Vistula, the Elbe, and the Weser.

(c) Maximilian of Bavaria retained the hereditary possession of the Upper Palatinate, and the electoral dignity. The Lower Palatinate was returned to Charles Lewis, the worthless son of the Win-

terking, for whom a new, the eighth electorship was created. Saxony retained Lusatia and parts of Magdeburg.

(d) The independence of Switzerland was formally recognized.

(e) The independence of the United Provinces, formally recognized by Spain, was silently acknowledged by the Congress.

479. Religious Settlement. — (a) The Treaty of Passau and the Religious Peace of Augsburg were confirmed.

(b) The Reservatum Ecclesiasticum was formally acknowledged by the Protestants.

(c) The year 1624 was fixed as the Normal Year; the holders of ecclesiastical property were confirmed in their territorial possessions and rights, which they held on the first day of January, 1624; if seized after that date, restitution had to be made.

The Protestants had demanded 1618, the Catholics 1629 as the normal year. The date as it stood, saved the ecclesiastical property of Bohemia and all the Austrian lands to the Church, but it left the territories recovered under the Edict of Restitution to the Protestants.

(d) The Calvinist estates were placed on the same footing with those of the Augsburg Confession.

(e) The Right of Reformation (cujus regio, illius religio) was conceded to the estates, and the permission to emigrate to the subjects, but with some restrictions: (a) if in 1624 Protestant subjects of Catholic princes or Catholic subjects of Protestant princes enjoyed freedom of worship, they retained this right; (b) if a Lutheran prince became a Calvinist, or the reverse, the subjects could not be forced to change their religion. In his hereditary lands the Emperor allowed no interference in his right of maintaining the Catholic religion, only in Silesia he granted favors to the Protestants.

(f) Catholics and Protestants were to be members of the imperial court in equal numbers. Disputes concerning the religious peace in the diet, were not to be decided by the majority rule, but by an amicable compact.

480. Political Clauses. — (a) All the immunities and chartered rights of the estates were confirmed.

(b) The estates may exercise their sovereignty in both spiritual and temporal matters. This clause had practical application to the Protestants alone.

(c) The estates assembled in diet (since 1663 permanent in Ratisbon) have a decisive vote in all matters of the Empire.

(d) The estates were allowed the right to form alliances with each other and with foreign powers, provided only that they were not directed against the Emperor, the Empire or the Peace of Westphalia.

(e) The Peace of Westphalia was to be the perpetual law of the Empire and to take precedence over all laws and charters; it must serve as a rule of conduct to the entire judiciary and must be sworn to by every candidate of the imperial dignity before his election. The Peace of Westphalia, politically, reduced the power of the Emperor to a shadow.

481. Character of the Peace. — The Peace of Westphalia contained numerous violations of the rights of the Church. Innocent X. protested against it in his bull Zelus domus Dei; but he did not blame Ferdinand III., who had endeavored to save what could be saved. On the other hand it placed the Catholics in a better condition than they enjoyed before the war. In 1617 nine-tenths of the Empire were overrun with Lutheranism and Calvinism; by the Peace Germany was divided into two parts of almost equal strength; the north was compactly Protestant, the south and west on the whole Catholic. In 1617 every German bishop or abbot had to fear a Mansfeld or a Christian of Brunswick; after 1648 all such fears were at an end. The Peace of Augsburg had given rise to endless misinterpretations. In the Peace of Westphalia everything was definite.

482. Effects of the War. — The effects of the Thirty Years' War were terrible. Three-fourths of the peasant population of Germany had perished in war or by pestilence and misery. Thousands of villages and towns were reduced to ashes. In one district of thirty-two square miles (Ruppin) only four villages remained. Similar cases existed all over the country. Those who outlived the ravages of the stranger, had sunk into a state of semi-barbarism. Commerce and agriculture lay prostrate for years. In all ranks life was meaner, poorer, harder, than it had been in the beginning of the century. The Empire had lost its power of resistance and became an easy prey to Louis XIV.

Gindely: vol. 3, ch. 6-7. — Gardiner: pp. 205-222. — Wakeman: pp. 120-128. — Bougeant, S. J.: *Histoire des guerres et des négociations qui précédèrent le traité de Westphalie.* — *Histories of the Thirty Years' War by:* A. Charvériat; Villermont, Du Yarry; Keim; Neubur; Winter; Rother; Opel; Droysen; Koch. — Menzel and other *German Histories.* — *On Peace of Westphalia:* H. P. B., v. 51, p. 557. — To *History of Peace of Westphalia:* H. P. B , v. 123, p. 513. — Flassan: *Histoire générale et raisonnée de la diplomatic française.* — Geijer: *Geschichte von Schweden.* — J. von Mailáth: *Geschichte des oesterreichischen Kaiserstaates.* — New; Coxe; Leger: *Histories of Austria.* — Huber: *Geschichte Oesterreichs.*

§ 8.

TERMINATION OF THE FRANCO-SPANISH WAR.

483. Spain and the Fronde. — France and Spain had failed to come to terms in the Peace of Westphalia, and the war between the two countries went on for eleven years more. Spain was in a desperate condition in 1648. She had been weakened by a revolt of Catalonia supported since 1640 by French troops, by the loss of Portugal, where John of Braganza was proclaimed king as John IV. (1640–56), by the crushing defeat at Rocroy (1643), and by a great rising of the people of Naples (1648). But suddenly the tables were completely turned, and Spain was saved by the outbreak of the Fronde, the rebellion of the Parliament, the princes and the nobility against the new order of things established by Richelieu.

484. The Fronde. — At the accession of Anne of Austria the Parliament of Paris not only reasserted its former claims, but abolished the council which the dying king had appointed for the support of the queen-regent. To the disgust of Parliament and the nobility, Anne chose Mazarin, Richelieu's pupil, for her prime minister. Mazarin upheld without flinching the authority of the infant king, and educated the growing youth in the lesson of Richelieu's absolute ways. The nobility and the Parliament of Paris arrayed themselves against Mazarin, who was faithfully supported by the queen-mother and as yet tolerated by the chief princes of the royal house. The Parliament of Paris bitterly opposed the Cardinal's schemes of oppressive taxation which were to enable him to continue the war against the House of Hapsburg. The officials and the creditors of the government, whose salaries and arrears were stopped for a year, swelled the number of the disaffected party called the Fronde. (Fronde = a sling used by boys in their contests.) The Florentine, Paul de Gondi, afterwards Cardinal de Retz, saw in Mazarin an obstacle in the way of his own ambition, and placed himself at the head of the Fronde. The Frondeurs had already won considerable concessions from the court, when a new victory of prince Condé III., the hero of Rocroy, emboldened the court to imprison two leading members of Parliament. At once, Paris was changed into an

armed camp, resounding with the cry of the next six years: "Down with Mazarin!" The queen was compelled to liberate the prisoners, 1648.

Thus began a civil war chiefly prompted by personal ambition, in which the foremost generals of France, Turenne first and subsequently prince Condé fought the battles of the rebels, while Mazarin was indefatigable in bribing, dividing and foiling the Frondeurs, though he had twice to bow before the storm and go into exile, a war in which province after province rose on one side or the other, and furious hostilities and hollow agreements followed in quick succession. When Louis XIV. in 1651 was declared of age, Condé allied himself with Spain, marched upon Paris, was routed in the suburb St. Antoine by Turenne, who had been won over by Mazarin, and was saved only by the Frondeurs, who held the capital and opened the gates to him and his shattered forces. Once inside, Condé roused the mob. But the firing of the city hall and the massacre of the notables loyal to Mazarin caused a reaction in favor of the king. Mazarin bribed Condé's friends into submission; the prince's army dwindled away, and Condé himself fled to Spain. In October, 1652, Louis XIV. entered his capital amidst a scene of the wildest rejoicing. The provinces were gradually reduced to obedience. With the surrender of Bordeaux, 1653, the wars of the Fronde came to a close.

The wars of the Fronde resulted in the supremacy and absolutism of the crown. The heads of the great houses, stripped of their independence, became court officers in the king's household, whilst the younger members found employment in the foreign wars of Louis XIV. The power of the Parliament of Paris was again reduced to the judicial functions of a body of magistrates, and the Intendants were restored to the powers which they had under Richelieu.

485. Close of the Spanish War. — Condé, after his flight from Paris, appeared in the Spanish Netherlands at the head of 30,000 men against Turenne's 60,000, and laid siege to Arras. Turenne at once attacked Condé, drove him to Brussels and secured the northern frontiers of France, 1654. French successes continued through 1655, whilst Condé won a great victory at Valenciennes the following year. To put an end to the Spanish war Mazarin in 1656 concluded an offensive alliance with Oliver Cromwell, Protector of the English Commonwealth. Dunkirk was the price which France had to pay Cromwell for his active assistance, whilst France was to take Gravelines. In 1657 Turenne took Mardyke which protected

Dunkirk, and handed it over to the English in pledge for Dunkirk. The Battle of the Dunes in 1658 decided the war. With Condé fought the Spanish infantry and the English and Irish auxiliaries under the exiled duke of York (afterwards James II. of England). With Turenne fought 6,000 of Cromwell's picked veterans, the "Ironsides." Condé suffered a crushing defeat and Dunkirk immediately surrendered. Two months later Gravelines also fell.

486. The Peace of the Pyrenees, 1659. — Both Spain and France were utterly exhausted and needed peace. Mazarin and the Spanish plenipotentiary on an island of the Bidassoa, a river in the western Pyrenees, and without any mediators, settled the terms. France retained Mardyke and a chain of fortresses on the northern frontiers and restored the rest of the conquests to Spain. Dunkirk remained English. But the part of the peace most important in its future bearings was the marriage arranged between Louis XIV. and the Infanta Maria Theresa of Spain. In the marriage contract the princess renounced in the strongest legal terms all her rights of succession to Spain or Spanish territories. On the part of Louis XIV. the marriage was intended to establish his claim to the Spanish monarchy in case the male line of the Spanish House of Hapsburg should become extinct. The marriage was the plan of Mazarin's life. As early as 1646, during the negotiations for the Peace of Westphalia, Mazarin had said that this marriage would enable France to claim the Spanish succession, however strong a renunciation of her rights the Infanta might sign. The marriage was solemnized in 1660.

Wakeman: *Europe, 1598–1715*, pp. 153–164. — Freer: *Regency of Anne of Austria.* — Motteville: *Memoirs of Anne of Austria.* — Cousin: *Duchesse de Longueville pendant la Fronde.* — Walter Fitzgerald: *The Great Condé and the Period of the Fronde.* — A. Feillet: *La Fronde et Saint Vincent de Paul.* — *Lives of Mazarin by* Masson; James (eminent Foreign Statesmen). — Hozier: *Turenne.* — James: *Retz.* — S. R. Gardiner: *Cromwell and Mazarin in 1652;* E. H. R., v. 11, p. 479. — Perkins: *France under Mazarin.* — Casimir Guillardin: *Hist du Regne de Louis XIV.* — *Histories of France and England.*

THE HUGUENOT WARS.

CHIEF RULERS OF THE PERIOD.

FRANCE: Francis II., 1559-1560.
Charles IX., 1560-1574.
Henry III., 1574-1589.
Henry IV., Bourbon, 1589-1610.
Louis XIII., 1610-1643.
Louis XIV., 1643-1715.

EMPERORS: Ferdinand I., 1556-1564.
Maximilian II., 1564-1576.
Rudolf II., 1576-1612.
Mathias, 1612-1619.
Ferdinand II., 1619-1637.
Ferdinand III , 1637-1657.

DENMARK: Christian IV., 1598-1648.

SWEDEN: Gustavus Adolphus, 1611-1632.

ENGLAND: Elisabeth, 1558-1603.
James I., 1603-1625.
Charles I., 1625-1649.

SPAIN: Philip II., 1555-1598.
Philip III., 1598-1619.
Philip IV., 1619-1660.

CAUSES *of the Outbreak and Continuation of the Huguenot Wars.*

1. Calvinist conspiracies, risings and massacres of Catholics *before* the so-called *Massacre of Vassy*, 1562. (*Conspiracy of Amboise*, 1560.)
2. Political opposition of the *Huguenots of Religion* (*Condé, Coligny*) and the *Huguenots of Politics* (*Montmorency*) against the Catholic party headed by the *House of Guise* under *Francis II.*
3. The trimming and unprincipled policy of the *Compromisers*, led by *Catharine de' Medici* and *L'Hôpital* (*Edict of Toleration*, 1562).
4. The alliance of the Huguenots with *Elisabeth of England*, the *German Protestants*, the *Calvinists of the Netherlands*, and other enemies of France, whose mercenaries overran the country and enabled the Huguenots to hold independent strongholds and to form a state within the state.
5. The *Massacre of St. Bartholomew's*, 1572.
6. The renewal of the unfortunate policy of the Compromisers by the "*Politicians*" under the *Duke of Alençon*, who by uniting with the Huguenots formed the party of the *Malcontents*, 1574.
7. The question of succession between **HENRY OF NAVARRE**, who as a Protestant was excluded by public law, and the candidates of the **HOLY LEAGUE** (*Charles X , Henry of Guise*).
8. The *Assassination* of the **GUISES** by *Henry III.*, 1588, and of *Henry III.* by *Clement*, 1589.

Wars.	*Battles.*	*Victory of:*	*Results of War.*	*Treaties of Peace.*
First War, 1562-63.	*Dreux.*	*Francis of Guise* over *Louis Condé.*	*Anthony of Navarre* fell at capture of *Rouen* from the English. *Condé* and *Montmorency* captured at *Dreux.* Marshal *St. André* murdered by a Huguenot after Dreux, and **FRANCIS OF GUISE** before *Orleans.*	*Peace of Amboise: Condé* pardoned, *Montmorency* released, freedom of worship in Huguenot cities. After the Peace the English expelled from *Havre* by *Montmorency* and *Condé.*

Second War, 1567–68.	*St. Denis.*	*Montmorency* over *Huguenots.*	Fall of *Montmorency.* Relief of *Orleans* by *Condé*, reinforced by German Calvinists.	*Peace of Longjumeau.* Renewal of Treaty of *Amboise.*	
Third War, 1569–70.	*Jarnac.*	*Henry, Duke of Anjou,* over Huguenots.	Fall of *Condé.*	*Peace of Germain-en-Laye:* Huguenots obtained freedom of worship in all France (exc. Paris) and four places of safety.	
	Montcontour.	Royal army over Huguenots.			
Fourth War, 1572–73, caused by the **MASSACRE OF ST. BARTHOLOMEW'S.**			Siege of *La Rochelle* by *Henry of Anjou*, who was called away to occupy the throne of *Poland.*	*Peace of La Rochelle:* Amnesty, restoration and freedom of worship in *La Rochelle* and other Calv. towns and feudal estates.	
Fifth War, 1574–76.	The Huguenots successful in the field.			*Peace of Boilieu:* Freedom of worship in all France (save *Paris* and at *court*); admission of Huguenots to *Parliament* and state offices; eight additional places.	
WARS OF THE LEAGUE: *Sixth War*, 1576–77. *Seventh War*, 1579–80.	The **HOLY LEAGUE** under the leadership of **HENRY OF GUISE** successful in the field. The Catholics successful in the field.			*Peace of Bergerac:* Renewal of most of the clauses of *Boilieu.*	
			Duke of Anjou, called to assume sovereignty over *Netherlands*, favors the Huguenots.	*Peace of Fleix:* The terms of *Bergerac.*	
The *Eighth Civil War*, the **WAR OF THE THREE HENRIES**, 1585–1589.	*Coutras*, 1587.	*Henry of Navarre* over *Holy League.* Henry of Guise expels the German Calvinists.	Revolution in Paris in favor of *Henry of Guise*, 1588. **ASSASSINATION OF THE GUISES** after States General at *Blois*, 1588. **ASSASSINATION OF HENRY** at the first siege of Paris by the King and Henry of Navarre, 1589.	Peace of Vervins with Spain. Mutual restoration of conquests, 1598.	
Continued by **HENRY IV.** as a war of succession till 1595, and with *Spain* till 1598.	*Ivry*, 1590.	*Henry IV.* over the *Duke of Mayenne*, head of the League.		The **EDICT OF NANTES**, 1598. Catholic worship restored in 1,300 towns and country parishes. The 750 Calvinistic communities still existing, obtained freedom of worship with the right of building churches and schools,	
	Second Siege of *Paris.*	*Alexander Farnese* relieves *Paris* and saves *Rouen*, 1592.	**HENRY IV.** makes profession of the Catholic faith, 1593, and receives the homage of *Cath.*		

THE HUGUENOT WARS — *Continued.*

Leaguers. Absolution of *Henry IV.* by *Clement VIII.* The *Duke of Mayenne* submits and disbands the League.

and of holding synods, representation in the Parliaments and equal political rights with the Catholics, and the permission to retain a number of *garrisoned places* for the next *eight years.*

THE DEFECTION OF THE NETHERLANDS.

CAUSES.

1. The personal contrast between *Charles V.* and **PHILIP II.**; national antipathy between *Spaniards* and *Netherlanders.*
2. The impoverished nobles, excluded from positions of emolument in the government of Philip II., hoped to retrieve their fortunes by a revolution.
3. The retention of a few thousand Spanish troops in the Netherlands.
4. The introduction of the *new hierarchy* established by *Paul IV.*, which the revolutionary party falsely decried as a violation of Philip's coronation oath, an infringement of their national rights and an introduction of the *Spanish Inquisition.*
5. The political agitation in favor of *Lutheranism* and *Calvinism* and the opposition to the religious edicts of *Charles V.* upheld by *Philip II.*
6. Chief cause was the treachery and ambition of **WILLIAM THE SILENT,** *prince of Orange.*

ADMINISTRATION OF MARGARET OF PARMA, 1559–1567.

1. **CARDINAL GRANVELLA**, furiously opposed by the disaffected party, was sacrificed by *Margaret* and recalled by *Philip II.*, 1564.
2. To counteract a strong Protestant agitation, *Philip II.* insisted on the execution of the *Caroline laws*, 1565.
3. The revolutionary party answered by the **COMPROMISE OF BREDA**, an association of nobles for the abolition of the religious laws. Formation of the party of the **GUEUX**, 1566.
4. Margaret, intimidated by the Confederates, suspends the religious laws, 1566.
5. Calvinist ministers, called from *Geneva* and *France*, make common cause with the *Gueux* (*meeting of Trond*), and cause a frightful outbreak of **ICONOCLASM**, 1566.
6. *Margaret of Parma*, supported by a Catholic reaction, succeeds in pacifying the country. Flight of *William of Orange*, 1567.

ADMINISTRATION OF THE DUKE OF ALVA, 1567–1573.

1. *Council of Trouble;* Punishments by death, exile or prison. Emigration. Execution of *Egmont* and *Horn*, 1568.
2. Invasion of *Ludwig of Nassau* (defeated at *Groeningen* and *Jemmingen*), and of *William the Silent*, forced out of the country by **ALVA'S** strategy, 1568.
3. Whilst *Alva* imposed exorbitant taxes, the *Water Gueux*, *Land Gueux* and *Bush Gueux* carry on a desultory warfare, 1569-72. **TAKING OF BRILL** by the *Water-Gueux*, conquest of the northern provinces; *William the Silent Stadtholder*, 1572.

4. Union of *Gueux* and *Huguenots*. The Huguenots under *Genlis* defeated by Don *Ferdinand of Toledo*, and *William the Silent* by *Alva* near *Mons*. Victorious campaign of Alva in the north, 1572.
5. Alva recalled upon the demand of all parties, 1573.

ADMINISTRATION OF REQUESENS, 1573–1576.

ADMINISTRATION OF DON JOHN OF AUSTRIA, 1576–78.

1. The Spanish Fury, especially in *Antwerp*, leads to the **PACIFICATION OF GHENT** and the **UNION OF BRUSSELS**, *i. e.*, the union of all provinces (exc. *Luxemburg*) for the expulsion of the Spanish troops, the defense of the ancient rights, and the guarantee of the Catholic religion in the southern provinces, 1576–77.
2. **DON JOHN OF AUSTRIA** accepts the *Pacification of Ghent* and the *Union of Brussels* in the *Perpetual Edict*, 1577.
3. *Don John*, in self defense against William's machinations, occupies *Namur*. William seizes *Ghent*. A third party, the Catholic Malcontents, call in *Archduke Mathias*, a mere tool of *William the Silent*.
4. **BATTLE OF GEMBLOURS**; the army of the States defeated by **ALEXANDER FARNESE** and **DON JOHN OF AUSTRIA**, 1578.
5. Death of Don *John of Austria*, 1578.

ADMINISTRATION OF ALEXANDER FARNESE, 1578–1592.

1. **UNION OF UTRECHT**, 1578; defection of the seven northern provinces from Spain. Calvinism the state religion.
2. **UNION OF ARRAS**, 1579. The *Walloon* provinces, to preserve the Catholic religion, return to the allegiance of *Spain*. Conquest of *Maestricht* by *Alexander Farnese*, 1579.
3. *Francis Duke of Anjou* called to an illusory sovereignty over the revolted provinces, cedes *Holland*, *Zeeland* and *Utrecht* to *William the Silent*, 1581.
4. Conquest of the rest of the ten southern provinces by **ALEXANDER FARNESE**, 1579–1585.
5. The Catholic Netherlands handed over by *Philip II.* to his daughter *Clara Eugenia Isabella* and her husband, *Archduke Albert of Austria*, 1598.

THE THIRTY YEARS' WAR, 1618–1648.

CAUSES.

1. The weakness of the successors of *Charles V.*: *Ferdinand I.* (1556–64); *Maximilian II.* (1564–76); *Rudolph II.* (1576–1612); *Mathias* (1612–19).
2. Frequent violations of the *Religious Peace of Augsburg* by the Protestant Princes, especially of the *Property* clause and the *Ecclesiastical Reservation*.
3. The rise of a strong **CALVINISTIC PARTY**, headed by the *Counts Palatine*, and supported by foreign Calvinists and the enemies of Austria (*England*, *France*, *Holland*).

THE THIRTY YEARS' WAR — *Continued.*

4. The affair of *Donauwoerth* and the secession of the Calvinist Party from the *Imperial Diet*, 1608.
5. The formation of the aggressive **EVANGELICAL UNION** under the Palsgraves *Frederic IV.* and *Frederic V.*, 1608.
6. The formation of the defensive **CATHOLIC LIGA** under **MAXIMILIAN OF BAVARIA**, 1609.
7. The fraternal war between *Rudolph II.* and *Mathias*, who had to make large concessions to the Protestants to maintain themselves, 1608–1611.
8. The attempt to murder the royal governors at *Prague* by *Count Thurn*, the leader of the Bohemian revolutionists, 1618.

THE BOHEMIAN WAR, 1618–1620.

Alliances.	*Battles.*	*Victory of:*	*Results.*	*Treaties of Peace.*
The Emperor **FERDINAND II.**, *Philip III.* and *IV.* of Spain, the **CATHOLIC LIGA**, *John George of Saxony* against the *Bohemian-Austrian-Hungarian League* in Bohemia and the *Evangelical Union* in the Palatinate.	**WHITE HILL** near Prague, 1620.	**MAXIMILIAN OF BAVARIA** and **TILLY** over *Frederic V.*, "*The Winterking.*"	Restoration of the Catholic religion in *Bohemia*, the breaking up of the Evangelical Union, the flight of the Winterking and the punishment of the rebels.	

THE PALATINE WAR, 1620–1623.

Mansfeld, the *Margrave of Baden*, and "*Madcap Christian of Brunswick*," aided by the *Dutch Republic* (the United Provinces) against the army of the *Liga*.	*Wimpfen*, 1622.	**TILLY** over the *Margrave.*		
	Hoechst, 1622.	**TILLY** over *Christian.*	The *Margrave* gave up the alliance. *Christian* fled to *Paris* and *Mansfeld* to *England.*	
	Stadtlohn, 1623.	**TILLY** over *Mansfeld.*		

THE DANISH WAR, 1625–29.

LEAGUE OF THE TREATY OF THE HAGUE, 1625: *Denmark*, *England*, *Holland*, and a number of the *Lower Saxon Princes*, under **CHRISTIAN IV.** of *Denmark*, sub-	**ELBE BRIDGE OF DESSAU**, 1626. **LUTTER AM BARENBERG**. 1626.	**WALLENSTEIN** over Mansfeld. **TILLY** over *Christian IV.*	Conquest of *Silesia*, of a great part of the *Lower Saxon Circle*, *Mecklenburg*, *Pomerania*, *Holstein* and *Jutland*, by the two generals. **EDICT OF RESTITUTION**, from which the	**PEACE OF LÜBECK**, 1629. *Christian IV.* restored to his hereditary possessions, renounced all claims to German territories, and withdrew from German affairs, 1630.

sidized by France (**RICHELIEU**) against the imperial army under **WALLENSTEIN** and the *Liguists* under **TILLY**.			loyal *John, George of Saxony* was exempted, 1629.	**DIET OF RATISBON.** *Wallenstein* dismissed upon complaints of the Princes.

THE SWEDISH WAR, 1630-1635.

I. Under **GUSTAVUS ADOLPHUS,** King of *Sweden,* 1630-32, who invaded Germany without a declaration of war, and occupied *Pomerania* and *Mecklenburg.* League of the Treaty of **BÄRWALDE** (*Richelieu*), 1631-32. *Sweden, England, France* (subsidy treaty), *Holland,* the German Protestants including *John George of Saxony* against the *House of Hapsburg* in *Austria* and *Spain.*	Storming of Magdeburg, 1631. Battle of **BREITENFELD,** 1631. Battle on the **LECH,** 1632. **LÜTZEN,** 1632.	*Pappenheim* and *Tilly Tilly* over Saxons. **GUSTAVUS ADOLPHUS** over *Tilly.* **GUSTAVUS** over *Tilly.* *Bernard of Weimar* over *Wallenstein.*	**MAGDEBURG DESTROYED** by the **SWEDISH** party. Conquest of *Middle Germany* by the *Swedes.* Conquest of Bavaria. Recall of Wallenstein. Fall of **GUSTAVUS ADOLPHUS** and *Pappenheim.*	
II. **UNDER QUEEN CHRISTINA** and **CHANCELLOR OXENSTYERNA,** 1632-35. *League of Heilbron* between *Sweden, France* (*Richelieu*), and the *Suabian, Franconian, Rhenish* and *Saxon Circles* (without John George of Saxony), to secure *Alsace to France, Pomerania* and *Magdeburg* to *Sweden.*	**NÖRDLINGEN,** 1634.	Archduke Ferdinand and Gallas over Bernard of Weimar and General Horn.	Treason and assassination of *Wallenstein,* 1634. Reconquest and pacification of nearly all northern Germany.	**PEACE OF PRAGUE,** 1635, between *Ferdinand II.* and the *Elector of Saxony.* The *Ecclesiastical Reservation* maintained. The working of the *Edict of Restitution* suspended for 40 years. All the prominent princes and imperial cities accepted the Peace.

THE THIRTY YEARS WARS — *Continued.*

THE FRANCO-SWEDISH WAR, 1635-48.

The war became chiefly a war of the *House of Bourbon* against the House of *Hapsburg* in *Austria, Italy, Spain* and the *Netherlands. Bernard of Weimar* and a few other German princes became mere vassals of France.	**WITTSTOCK**, 1636.	Swedish general *Baner* over *Imperial* and *Saxon* army.	*Saxony* reduced to a desert. Germany up and down the camping ground of the Swedes who committed unspeakable atrocities, and reduced *Bohemia* to a desert.
	ROCROY, 1643.	**PRINCE CONDÉ** annihilates the Spanish army in the Netherlands.	
The Swedes fought for law and money.	**ALLERSHEIM**, 1645.	**CONDÉ** and **TURENNE** over the Imperialists.	The union of the French under **TURENNE** and the Swedes reduced *Bavaria* to the state of *Saxony* and *Bohemia.*

Death of **RICHELIEU**, 1642 (Dec.) and of **LOUIS XIII.**, 1643. **MAZARIN**, prime minister in France.

Death of **FERDINAND II.**, succeeded by **FERDINAND III.**, 1637-1657.

PEACE OF WESTPHALIA, 1648. Negotiations at *Osnabrück* and *Münster*, 1643-1648. Terms: (*a*) *France* retained *Metz*, *Toul* and *Verdun*, and obtained **ALSACE**, *Breisach* and *Pignerol* with **FREE ACCESS TO GERMANY AND ITALY**. (*b*) *Sweden* received parts of *Pomerania* and *Mecklenburg*, *Bremen* and *Verden*, and a number of islands with control of the mouths of the *Vistula*, the *Elbe* and the *Weser*. (*c*) *Maximilian of Bavaria* obtained the *Upper Palatinate* and the *Electorship*; *Charles Lewis*, the son of the Winterking, the *Lower Palatinate* and the *eighth* Electorship. (*d*) The independence of **SWITZERLAND** and the **UNITED PROVINCES** recognized.

RELIGIOUS SETTLEMENT. The *Treaty of Passau*, the *Religious Peace of Augsburg*, the *Ecclesiastical Reservation* and the *jus reformandi* (modified) were maintained, and the year 1624 fixed as the *normal year* for the possession of church property.

CHAPTER IV.

THE PURITAN REVOLUTION.

§ 1.

JAMES I., 1603–1625.

487. Accession and Character of James I. — James VI. of Scotland (1567–1625), the son of Mary Stuart, favored by Elisabeth on her deathbed, succeeded her in England as James I. He was middle-aged when he entered England, ungainly in external appearance, shrewd but vacillating in politics, well versed in foreign affairs, but unable to understand the English character. He was most tenacious of the royal prerogatives as developed during the Tudor reigns. He was a learned but pedantic scholar and voluminous writer on all kinds of subjects, but chiefly theology and witchcraft, "the learnedest fool in Christendom." A hard drinker and a hard swearer, he preferred the chase and the cockpit, buffooneries and carousals, to the details of government, which he left to his favorites. If he was not immoral in other respects, he allowed the grossest immoralities at his court. Such a character was not likely to gain the confidence of his English subjects.

488. Religious Position of James I. — Two classes hailed the accession of James I. with joyful expectations. The Catholics, encouraged by secret promises, looked for fair treatment from the son of Mary Stuart. The Puritans hoped everything from a king who had been educated in their own religion. But James favored Episcopacy and uniformity of worship as more conducive to his authority as king and "supreme head." "No bishop, no king," was his favorite maxim. Even in Scotland he had introduced a mild form of Episcopacy in 1600. To give some satisfaction to the Catholics, he relaxed the execution of the penal laws, but without repealing them. Numerous conversions — 30,000 were claimed in a short space of time — were the result of the relaxation. The Puritans were admitted to a conference at Hampton Court, but to their consternation and the intense delight of the Angelican prelates "the king soundly peppered the Puritans" with Latin quotations from Scriptures and the Fathers, and obliged them to conform to the established ritual (1604). But

when the Puritans, supported by the younger Cecil and the privy council, charged him with favoring Popery, he got frightened and again placed the Catholics under the lash of the penal laws. Over 6,000 Catholics suffered in a single year. In the county of Hereford alone, 409 families were reduced to beggary.

489. The Gunpowder Plot, 1604–1605. — These penal measures provoked a number of rash Catholics, Guy Fawkes, Percy, the Wrights, the Winters, and others, under the leadership of the energetic Catesby, to engage in a plot for the purpose of blowing up the King, Lords and Commons.

Catesby was a rich gentleman of an ancient and honorable family, brave, accomplished, honest of purpose, exceedingly zealous for his religion, in his dealings with others a born leader of men. But he was also infected with the worldliness of Elisabeth's period, impatient of persecution, and obstinately clinging to his own views and plans, — traits which worked ruin upon himself and all who came in contact with him. Twice he allowed his project to drop when political changes seemed to promise relief for the Catholics.

The usual story is that the conspiracy was betrayed through a letter which Tresham, one of the plotters, sent to Lord Monteagle warning him not to attend the opening of Parliament, and that Monteagle showed the letter to Cecil, the king's secretary. But there exists considerable contemporary evidence to show, that the "wily minister was already aware of the plot, — that he was in communication with some of the conspirators, and that it was by his connivance that the Jesuit fathers had become entangled in the scheme. Far from wishing to put a stop to the design, he had suffered it to go on, hoping by skillful management to cast the odium of so foul a conspiracy on the whole Catholic body." When the plot was ripe, a party was sent to search the cellars in the Parliament building, where thirty-two barrels of gunpowder were concealed. Fawkes was taken at the entrance with lanterns and matches. The rest of the conspirators fled into Staffordshire. Catesby, the Wrights and a few others were shot dead by the pursuing sheriffs, the rest of the accomplices were tried and executed.

490. Father Garnet. — The first to be indicted and the last to be executed was the gentle and peace-loving Father Garnet, Provincial of the English Jesuits. He had been consulted in confession by another confessor, Father

Greenway, to whom the plot had been communicated under the sacramental seal, a few days before its discovery. Both had severely condemned the nefarious design and used their utmost efforts to prevent its execution. But they could not reveal a secret of confession. The indictment charged Father Garnet with being the prime mover of the plot, and specified fourteen treasonable acts. After long and searching investigations, the authorship of the plot and the fourteen treasonable acts had to be dropped, and Father Garnet's guilt was based upon a conversation, which he had with Catesby some months before he heard of the plot in confession. At the trial no legal proof whatever was forthcoming that Catesby in his conversation referred to a plot against the king. The only intimation which Cecil obtained, that Father Garnet had *any* knowledge of the plot, was by ordering his spies to overhear a confession of the Father to another imprisoned priest, who had been placed in communication with him for this very purpose. Thus while Father Garnet was condemned for a supposed act of treason which it was impossible to prove by legal means, he was really put to death out of hatred to the faith. For the king declared that Popery, the mystery of iniquity, was the only cause of the conspiracy, and Lord Salisbury (Robert Cecil) stated, that the trial was intended to be "an anatomy of Popish doctrine whence these treasons have their source and support." Father Garnet had received orders both from the Pope and from the General of his Order, to discountenance any resistance to the king among English Catholics, and he had not only conscientiously carried them out on all occasions, but had even petitioned Rome to put excommunication on any act of Catholic resistance.

491. Increased Persecutions. — All the Catholics of England, though perfectly innocent, had to suffer for the miserable crime of a few fanatics. Parliament added seventy fresh articles to the penal code. For the first time a sacramental test was introduced. All were obliged under heavy fines not only to attend the Anglican service, but also to receive the Sacrament from the hand of a Protestant minister. The king was empowered to refuse the recusancy fines, and to seize at once the land of the recusant. Catholics were excluded from all professions, from the right of acting as executors of wills, as guardians to the children of a relative. They were fined if they married, and fined again if they had their children baptized. A new oath of allegiance was framed, which was condemned by Paul V. as containing errors against the faith. Those who refused to take it were punished by the harsh penalties of Praemunire, and those who took it, were still subject to the penalties of recusancy. Numbers of landed gentlemen were reduced to beggary. The

prisons were soon crowded with loyal Catholics, who could not be induced to betray their conscience by taking the new test oaths. Spies and informers (pursuivants) swarmed over the country, and treated the Catholics with overbearing insolence. Even the aged and weak were frequently subjected to personal violence. Eighteen priests and seven laymen were executed *solely* for their profession of the Catholic faith during the remainder of this reign.

There were, however, periods of relaxation in the method of persecution, owing to the king's natural aversion to cruelty, his friendly relations with Spain, and the influence of courtiers connected with Catholic families.

492. **Favorites.** — James I. was obliged to dissolve his first and second Parliaments (1611 and 1614) without having reached an agreement about questions in dispute such as the union of England and Scotland, methods of taxation, and money impositions or duties raised solely by the authority of the king, as had been the custom under Elisabeth. Meanwhile he carried on his government by the aid of his favorites. Cecil, earl of Salisbury, died in 1612. His place was filled by the low-born Robert Carr, a Scotch page, whom the king had overwhelmed with riches and honors, and who requited his master's benefits by scandalous crimes. Villiers, the next favorite, a young Englishman who had been introduced to the king in 1615, was successively created viscount Villiers, earl, marquis and duke of Buckingham. He obtained the high admiralship and other state offices, and was made the dispenser of the royal patronage. In a short time he became the richest peer of England.

493. James' Third Parliament, 1621. — The progress of the Thirty Years' War in Germany induced James to call his third Parliament, 1621. For though the king was very much averse to a religious war, he desired to have the means of interfering in favor of the Winterking, his son-in-law. But the Puritans, now the leading power in the Commons, were determined to obtain some substantial returns for their money grants. After voting the subsidies, the Commons attacked the monopolies, which they regarded merely as a scheme to enrich Buckingham and his flatterers, and compelled the king to recall them. The investigation had brought to light an unprecedented amount of fraud and corruption. Accordingly the Commons revived parliamentary impeachments by which the House of Commons acting as a grand jury for the whole country presented offenders against the commonwealth to be judged by the Lords.

There had been no impeachment since the reign of Henry VI. The first and most important victim was the royal chancellor, the scholarly but unprincipled Francis Bacon, Lord Verulam, who acknowledged that he was guilty of corruption. The king practically released him from the severer penalties imposed by Parliament. Meeting again in winter, the Commons handed in a petition, inveighing against the Pope, the king of Spain, and the English Catholics and called upon James to draw the sword for the Winterking and to impose new burdens on the Catholics at home. In his answer the king prohibited Parliament from meddling with "mysteries of state," declared the privileges of the House to be mere grants of the crown, and claimed the right of punishing the insolent behavior of any member inside of Parliament or out of it. The House after a long debate, entered a Protestation in the journal, by which they declared the privileges of the House the ancient and undoubted inheritance of Englishmen, and insisted on freedom of speech in all matters of public concern. James sent for the journal, and in presence of the council and the judges tore out the Protestation with his own hand, and dissolved Parliament.

494. Marriage Plans. — The king, partly led by the idea that he could more effectively work for the peace of Europe by an alliance with a Catholic Power and partly by the expectation of a rich dowry, sought a marriage union between Charles, the prince of Wales, and the Infanta Maria of Spain, the sister of king Philip IV. Accompanied by Buckingham Charles visited the Spanish court in 1623. The engagement was freely and solemnly concluded, signed and sworn to by the prince and the kings of England and Spain; wantonly broken by Charles upon Buckingham's advice and repudiated by James I. on account of the misrepresentations of his son and his favorite. This public insult to Spain was an act of vengeance on the part of Buckingham, who had been severely punished in Spain for a wicked intrigue. The following year a treaty was signed with France, by which the prince of Wales was to marry Henrietta Maria, sister of Louis XIII. James and Charles pledged themselves to allow the future queen of England to maintain her Catholic household and to grant liberty of worship to loyal Catholics.

495. Last Parliament and Death of James I. — The loss of the expected Spanish dowry compelled the king to call a Parliament. Buckingham made a garbled report of the Spanish negotiations, and putting himself forward as the spokesman of war with

Spain became for a short time the most popular man in England. But since the king wanted a land war in the Palatinate, Parliament a naval war with Spain, and the favorite *both*, Parliament refused to place the war subsidies at the king's disposal, and committed them to a council of war. This want of supplies almost wrecked the expedition to the continent, which Mansfeld had organized in England after his failure in the Palatine war. Before the question of war, however, came to an issue, James I. died of tertian fever in March, 1625, and was succeeded by his son Charles I.

Books for Consultation. I. POLITICAL. — Lingard: *A History of England* (Am. Edit.), vol. 9, chs. 1-3. — Samuel Rawson Gardiner: *History of England from the Accession of James I. to the Outbreak of the Civil War, in 10 Volumes*, vol. 1, 1603-1607; vols. 2 and 3, 1607-1616; 1616-1621; vol. 4, 1621-23; vol. 5, 1623-25; *Student's History of England*, vol. 2; *James I.*, pp. 481-501; *Puritan Revolution* (*Epochs*), ch. 1-3; *History of the Spanish Marriages.* — Drane: *Hist. of England; James I.*, pp. 440-455. — Green: *History of the English People*, vol. 2, Book 7, chs. 1-4. — *Annals of James I.* — Goodman: *Court of King James I.* — Spedding ed.: *Letters and Works of Bacon.* — R. M. Johnston: *King James I. of England*, A. C. Q., v. 17, p. 407. — Stevenson: *Anne of Denmark, Catholic Wife of James I.*, M., v. 17, p. 256.—Plenkers: *Conversion der dänischen Princessin Anna Gemahlin Jacobs I.*, St., vol. 35, pp. 327, 491.* Strickland: *Queens of England; Anne of Denmark.* — Oppenheim: *The Royal Navy Under James I.*, E. H. R. v. 7, p. 471. — Sir J. R. Seeley: *The Growth of the English Policy.*— On *Francis Bacon*, E. R. '61, 1, p. 309; '79, 2, 395.

RELIGIOUS. — *Henry Garnet*, M. '78, 3, p. 202.— J. H. Pollen: *Father Henry Garnet and the Gunpowder Plot*, M. '87, 3, p. 305; '88, 2, pp. 58, 382; 3, p. 41. — J. Gerard: *The Gunpowder Plot*, M. '94, 2, p. 487; '95, 1, pp. 1, 183; 345, 478; 2, p. 33. — John Gerard, S. J.: *What was the Gunpowder Plot? The Traditional Story Tested by Original Evidence.*— Gardiner: *What Gunpowder Plot Was.* — J. Gerard: *The Gunpowder Plot and the Gunpowder Plotters;* (in reply to Gardiner); *The Problem of the Gunpowder Plot:* M. '97, 2, pp. 25, 350, 455. — G. Gerard: *Contributions Toward a Life of Father H. Garnet*, M. '98, 1, pp. 6, 121, 238, 356, 458, 603. — J. Gerard: *F. Garnet and his Accusers*, M. '98' 2, p. 144.— *Garnet's Examination:* Brother Foley: *Records of the Engl. Province of the S. J.* — J. Gerard: *Th. Winter's Confession and the Gunpowder Plot.* — *F. Garnet's Declaration in Full*, E. H. R., v. 3, p. 510. — Jardine: *Gunpowder Plot.* — Dom Bede Camm. O. S. B., *The Gunpowder Plot*, D. R., '97, 2, p. 299. — Pfülf: *Die Controverse über die Pulververschwörung*, St. v. 56, pp. 41, 142, 286. — E. H. Thompson: *Before and after Gunpowder Plot* (C. T. S. P., v. 5). — J. Morris, S. J.: *Condition of Catholics under James I.* — *F. Gerard's Narrative of the Gunpowder Plot.* — Conway: *The Story of a Scottish Martyr: State of the Church in Scotland, 1580-1615*, M. '78, 1, 84, 171, 337.— W. Forbes-Leith: *Narratives of Scottish Catholics under Mary Stuart and James VI.*— Kobler: *Die Martyrer Englands im 16 und 17 Jahrh*, I. K. Z., '84, p. 1, 241. — Zimmerman: *Gesch. der engl. Katholiken unter Jacob I.*, Katholik, '89, 2, 253; '91, 1, p. 231. — J. M. Stone: *Atheism under Elisabeth and James I.*, M. '94, 2, p. 174. — R. Parsons: *Paul V.; The Prohibition of the English Test Oath*; *Studies*, v. 4, p. 1; *The Gunpowder Plot*, p. 20

* James VI. married Anne of Denmark, the Lutheran daughter of Frederick II. She sought instruction in the Catholic religion at the Scotch court, was received by Father Abercromby, S. J. (1600-1601), and remained a steadfast Catholic to her death, 1619.

§ 2.

CHARLES I. (1625–1649), AND HIS FIRST PARLIAMENTS.

496. First Parliament, 1625. — Charles I. met his first Parliament the day after he had conducted his wife Henrietta Maria, from Dover to London. The House of Commons was chiefly composed of Puritan zealots "the Saints," and members of the "country party" who were contending for an increase of parliamentary power and opposed to the royal prerogative. The king asked for supplies to pay the debts of his father (700,000*l.*), and to meet the expenses of the war with Spain. The Commons voted for an insignificant subsidy — 40,000*l.* out of the necessary million — restricted to one year the royal duties of tonnage and poundage, which since the reign of Henry VI. had been always granted for life, and resolved to oppose any grant of money not coupled with the redress of some national grievance or royal claim. Under abolition of national grievances they understood a stringent persecution of Catholics and Anglicans, the abolition of all taxes not granted by Parliament, and the removal of Buckingham "the grievance of grievances." When Charles saw that the Commons were meditating the impeachment of his favorite, he hastily dissolved the Parliament.

497. Charles and the Second Parliament. — By means of loans and money impositions on imported goods the king managed to fit out a fleet and send it to Spain under Buckingham's command. But his plan of capturing Cadiz and heading off the Spanish treasure ships expected from America completely failed. At the end of his resources the king was compelled to call a new Parliament, in which the Puritan element was still stronger than in the first. Buckingham's position now became critical. The earl of Bristol, the English ambassador at Madrid, disclosed the whole network of intrigues of which Buckingham had been guilty in the affair of the Spanish match. With a formidable array of real or imaginary crimes the House of Commons proceeded to the actual impeachment of the favorite, whereupon Charles again dissolved the Parliament.

498. The Last Huguenot War — Buckingham's Part in it. — The Huguenots in France had still their garrisoned places of security and formed a state within the state, constantly endangering the unity of the realm. In the province of Bearn they had, in violation of the Edict of Nantes, refused to tolerate the Catholics, expelled the priests and seized the property of the Church. When Louis XIII. in 1620 reinstated the Catholics by a military demonstration, two brothers, the dukes of Rohan and Soubise, rose in rebellion, and rekindled the civil war. They were

defeated and gradually lost all their fortified cities except La Rochelle. The Huguenots prepared for a new struggle. They pounced upon six royal ships and towed them into the harbor of La Rochelle. La Rochelle renounced the king's authority and proclaimed itself a Calvinistic Republic. Louis began the blockade of this last stronghold of political Calvinism. Richelieu succeeded in borrowing ships from Holland and England to attack the city from the sea side. The Puritans were angered at the sight of English ships employed against their brethren in France, and Buckingham rushed to the opposite extreme. Charles put himself forward as the protector of the Huguenots, renewed the persecution of the English Catholics, and sent home the French household of his Catholic queen. Both these measures were a violation of the marriage contract. A quarrel about the carrying-trade leading to the seizure of merchant ships on both sides complicated matters. Thus war broke out between England and France in 1627, and Buckingham himself led a fleet of 100 vessels to the island of Rhé, opposite La Rochelle. The expedition, notwithstanding Buckingham's personal bravery, proved another complete failure, and increased the favorite's unpopularity. Meanwhile the blockade of La Rochelle was pushed on with vigor. Richelieu himself superintended the building of a stupendous sea wall to cut off all help from foreign fleets. In 1628 Buckingham, treating with contempt an angry Remonstrance of Parliament against himself addressed to the king, went to Portsmouth to assume command of a new fleet equipped for the relief of La Rochelle. Here he was assassinated by Felton, one of his former soldiers, who boasted of his crime as a worthy service to God and his country. The fleet sailing under a new commander, failed utterly. Hunger forced the Rochellese to surrender the same year. With the fall of La Rochelle French Calvinism as a political organization ceased to exist. Richelieu granted the Huguenots liberty of worship and civil equality, thus confirming the Edict of Nantes. The most influential leaders gradually returned to the Church. With the fall of La Rochelle ended for the time England's interference in continental wars. Peace was made with France in 1629, and with Spain in 1630.

499. Taxation and Other Grievances. — As the second Parliament was dissolved before voting any subsidies, Charles raised

money by levying duties on imports and exports (tonnage and poundage), by raising the income proceeding from the crown lands, by confiscating two-thirds of the property of wealthy Catholics, and by a forced loan. Rich men who refused to pay were sent to prison, poor men pressed for military service, soldiers billeted on householders without their consent, and martial law was extended to civilians by the sole order of the king. In the third Parliament, (1628) Eliot, the foremost agitator for parliamentary supremacy, supported by the lawyers, brought forward a Petition of Rights for the removal of these grievances. The king, in order to obtain the subsidies of which he was absolutely in need, gave the petition his royal assent. It became thus the law of the land, that no forced loans or taxes were to be imposed without a parliamentary grant; that no one could be imprisoned without cause shown, that civilians were to be free from martial law or enforced quartering. The Bill of Rights was the first restriction of royal power as assumed by the Tudors.

Parliament next took up the question of tonnage and poundage, claiming that the Bill of Rights made the levying of these duties illegal. Charles with better right maintained, that custom duties were not included in the clause regulating taxes. The question really involved the supremacy of king or Parliament; for Parliament by a refusal of this duty could reduce the king to bankruptcy, while the king, if he could levy such duties by his own authority, was enabled to rule without Parliament. The debates on this point were further complicated and embittered by the religious question.

500. The Question of Religion. — Whilst Puritanism was strong in Parliament and among the lower clergy, a growing minority of Anglican ministers rejected the doctrine of absolute predestination, revived a number of ceremonies that had fallen into disuse, and preached passive obedience to the king in all things. At their head stood Laud, bishop of London. The Puritans were filled with an intense hatred of the Pope and stirred up to fury by Tilly's victories on the continent. They suspected the king and the Anglican clergy, though without reason, of leaning towards Catholicism, and thought that if the custom duties were granted, Charles would use his power in favor of the Catholics. It was now the Puritan Commons who claimed the spiritual authority against the king, which Henry VIII. had usurped against the Pope. They

asserted that the Commons and not the clergy had the right of settling doctrinal and ceremonial disputes, set themselves as a tribunal of inquisition over the Anglican bishops, and summoned them before the bar of the House. Meanwhile they called some custom house officers, who had enforced tonnage and poundage, to appear before them. The king forbade his officers to appear, a prohibition which was clearly within his right, since they had only obeyed orders, and adjourned the session. Then in a scene of riotous tumult the speaker was prevented by force from reading the order of adjournment, while Eliot put three resolutions to the vote: (a) that all supporters of Popery and Arminianism (Anglicanism), (b) all who advised the levy of tonnage and poundage without parliamentary grant, (c) and all who paid such duties, were enemies of the kingdom and betrayers of its liberties. The resolutions were adopted with loud shouts of assent. The king dissolved Parliament and sent Eliot and some others to the Tower. For the next eleven years Charles I. ruled without Parliament.

Lingard: vol. 9, ch. 4. — L. R. Gardiner: vol. 6, *Charles I.*, 1625–29; vol. 7 (1629–35), pp. 1–122; *Student's Hist.:* vol. 2, *The Growth of the Personal Government of Charles I.*, pp. 502–519; *Epochs:* chs. 3 and 4, pp. 48–70. — Drane: *Charles I.*, pp. 456–62. — Green: Book 7, ch. 5. — P. Delattre: *Une Fille de Henri IV.* (*Henrietta Maria*). — Strickland: *Queens of Engl. Henrietta Maria* (vol. 4). — Henri de la Garde: *Le Duc de Rohan et les Protestants sous Louis XIII.* — (See, also, *Histories of the Huguenot Wars; of Louis XIII.; of Richelieu,* other Literature, E. R., '90, 1, p. 389.) — Fellowes: *Historical Sketches of Charles I.* — Laud: *Diary.* — Forster: *Sir John Eliot.* — Stubbs: *Petition of Rights. 1628; Select Charters, Appendix.* — Hannay: *A Short History of the Royal Navy* (*1217–1688*). — Oppenheim: *The Royal Navy under Charles I.:* E. H. R., v. 8, p. 467; v. 9, pp. 92, 473.

§ 3.

FIRST RUMBLINGS OF THE CIVIL WAR.

501. A Calm Before the Storm, 1630–1642. — Charles flattered himself to be able to free the crown from its dependence on Parliament, not by a standing army, but by peace and economy. The first years of the king's personal rule were, on the whole, years of peace and quiet. The king provided for his needs by collecting custom dues, judicial fines, feudal penalties not yet repealed by Parliament, monopolies and ship-money. Charles himself was frugal and laborious, his administration economical. The Star Chamber, comprising the members of the Privy Council and two judges, tried all kinds of cases, passed cruel sentences on scurrilous pamphleteers, and protected the poor against the oppression of the rich. The country was

in a state of great prosperity. Catholics enjoyed a period of rare tranquillity. The king's chief advisers were the energetic and masterful Thomas Wentworth, by far the ablest minister of Charles I., made earl of Strafford in 1639, and Laud, since 1633 archbishop of Canterbury. With the aid of the High Commission and the Star Chamber, Laud attacked Calvinism among the clergy, silenced or removed Puritan ministers, filled vacancies with High Church clergymen, enforced uniformity of Anglican teaching and liturgy, encouraged Sunday sports, which were bitterly opposed by the "Saints," and by his measures drove thousands to Holland or New England in America, and made nine-tenths of the English Protestants his enemies. The suspicion, however, under which he fell of working for a union with Rome, was entirely unfounded.

502. Ship-money. — In view of the naval power of France and Holland, Charles considered it his duty to equip a fleet capable of coping with the navies of both countries. Following precedents of earlier reigns, the king issued writs to the port towns, 1634, to obtain money for building and equipping ships at London. The following year he extended these writs, against ancient precedents, to the inland counties. By this means he got a strong and well-manned fleet and became the founder of the English navy as distinct from its merchant marine. This ship-money levied year after year, caused complaints all over the country, because the money was raised by royal writ and not by parliamentary grant. To test the right of the king, John Hampden, a rich landowner of Buckinghamshire and the intimate friend of Eliot, refused to pay the 20*s.* of ship-money levied on his estates. Of the twelve judges of the Exchequer, who tried his case, seven decided in favor of the king's rights. Accordingly the king continued to levy ship-money. But the arguments of the opposition were spread all over England, and ship-money became the war cry, and Hampden one of the most popular leaders of the disaffected party (1638).

503. The Bishops' Wars, 1639 and 1640. — Charles' attempt to introduce in Scotland a Book of Common Prayer adverse to Presbyterianism encountered the opposition both of the clergy and the nobility, who were irritated by a previous order of the king's to restore some of the church lands to the bishops. The reading of the new service at Edinburgh led to a riotous outbreak, 1637. All over Scotland, except in the north, a National Covenant

was signed by which the signers bound themselves to recover the "purity and liberty of the gospel." The Assembly of Glasgow consisting of 144 ministers and 96 laymen, chiefly nobles, declared its own absolute supremacy by divine right, and though dissolved by royal authority, abolished Episcopacy and re-established Presbyterianism. This was open rebellion. The king declared the question was no longer Episcopacy or Presbyterianism, but "whether we are their king or not." Charles gathered a raw army at York and marched as far as Berwick, where he was met by 10,000 Scots under Alexander Leslie, who had received his military training in the camp of Gustavus Adolphus. Rather than fight with his untried forces, Charles assented to the gathering of a free assembly and a Scotch Parliament, 1639. Both declared for the abolition of Episcopacy. Charles dissolved them and prepared for a new struggle, whilst the Scots drifted into republicanism, and established a provisional government, the Committee of Estates. It issued to Argyle, the head of the Campbells, a commission of fire and sword "to secure the loyal North" to the Covenanters. Amidst the plundering, burning and slaying of the Covenanters, the northern adherents of the king were forced to sign the Covenant.

Upon the advice of Wentworth, now earl of Strafford, Charles with a heavy heart summoned what was afterwards called the Short Parliament. Instead of granting supplies it renewed the former complaints and was dissolved three weeks after it met. A second attempt of the king to coerce the Scots with an army hastily pressed into service failed. It was full of men who sympathized with the Scots, had no spirit to fight and was easily defeated at Newburn on the Tyne. A treaty was signed at Ripon which left Northumberland and Durham in the hands of the Scots as security for the payment of their war expenses.

504. The Execution of the Earl of Strafford, 1641. — The Treaty of Ripon, the exhaustion of all royal resources, and the strong recommendation of a great council of peers at York, made it necessary for the king to call the Parliment which came to be known as the Long Parliament. It did not rely on the king's co-operation, but on the army of Scotch rebels quartered in the northern counties. Under Pym's leadership it began to exercise the supremacy for which former Parliaments had fought. Its first step was to demand the expulsion of Catholics from court and army, and to petition the king

for the blood of priests. The next condemned ship money, and other royal methods of raising a revenue. Then came the great blow directed against the king, the impeachment of Strafford and Laud. Both were sent to the Tower. Other officers of the crown fled to the continent.

Strafford's magnificent defense before the Lords made it all but sure that they would acquit him. His intention to lead an army against England could hardly be proved. Treason, strictly defined by Edward III. as "a levying of war against the king or a compassing of his death" could not be charged to him. Accordingly the Commons dropped the impeachment and passed a Bill of Attainder. The former required judgment by the Lords on legal evidence: the latter was an act of power in which no reasons needed be given. The discovery by Pym of an army plot known to the king and favored by the queen, to march upon London, seize the Tower, and free Strafford, frightened the Lords into passing the Bill of Attainder. After a terrible struggle with his conscience, Charles seeing his wife and family exposed to the threats of the London mob surrounding Whitehall, signed the death warrant. Strafford went to the block with the words: "Put not your trust in princes." He died for his loyalty to Charles and his eminence as a statesman rather than for any punishable crime (May 12, 1641). Laud was executed in the beginning of 1645.

505. Political Acts of Parliament. — On the day when Charles signed the death warrant, he also signed an act, by which Parliament declared itself indissoluble save by its own consent; other acts followed, abolishing the courts of Star Chamber and High Commission, and sweeping away all taxes and duties not granted by Parliament. Thus the royal powers practiced since Henry VII.'s reign by Tudors and Stuarts, came to an end, and a Parliament, no longer responsible to king or constituents, assumed sovereignty in England. The first step in the revolution was taken.

The execution of Strafford was followed by the pacification between England and Scotland. The two armies in the north were disbanded. The king paid a visit to Scotland to reconcile the Scotch nation. During his absence the nucleus of a royal party was formed in Parliament under Hyde and Falkland to put a stop to further aggressions of the Commons. Whilst the Long Parliament had been sufficiently united to pass the political bills, it split on the Church question. The Prelatists, led by Hyde and Lord Falkland, desired reforms within the Episcopal system. The Puritans under Pym and Hampden demanded Presbyterianism pure and simple. A bill to throw out the bishops from the Upper House was defeated by the Lords. Thereupon

the Commons brought in the Root and Branch bill for the entire abolition of Episcopacy, all ecclesiastical jurisdiction to be exercised in each diocese by a committee of laymen. The bill was kept over for future action.

506. Progress of the Parliamentary Revolution — The Grand Remonstrance. — Before the king's return wildly exaggerated news of a rising in Ireland reached England. Its Parliament at once passed a resolution "never to tolerate the Catholic worship in any part of the king's dominion," and ordered a general persecution of the Catholics in England. To deprive the king of the control of the army to be sent to Ireland, Pym and Hampden drew up the Grand Remonstrance, beginning with a long list of exaggerated charges against the king, and ending with the demand, that both the ministers of the king and the divines regulating ecclesiastical affairs should be responsible to the Parliament. The bill implied nothing less than the sovereignty of Parliament over church and state. Before the end of the year the party of Pym, supported by the London mob, demanded the exclusion of the bishops and the Catholic peers from the House of Lords. Twelve bishops who left the sessions of the Upper House on account of an insult offered them in the streets, protested that they would consider anything done in the House of Lords during their absence as null and void. This rash protest was answered by an equally rash impeachment of the bishops as traitors by the Commons. The twelve bishops were sent to the Tower. If the Commons had no intention to press the charge of treason, they were rid at least of the bishops' votes, 1642.

507. The Five Members. — Charles now resolved to strike a counter-blow. Five members of the House of Commons, among them Pym and Hampden, had carried on a correspondence with the Scots and had invited them in 1640 to invade England. It was a clear case of treason. By the king's order the attorney-general impeached the members before the House of Lords. A herald appeared at the bar of the Commons to demand their surrender. The five members fled to the city. When Charles the next day appeared in the Commons followed by an armed force to arrest the members, he was defied to his face. The ill-advised attempt completed the humiliation of the king. The city declared for the Commons. The news that the five members were to be conducted in triumph to

Westminster induced the king to withdraw to Hampton court and thence to Windsor.

508. Preparations for War. — Nothing but the sword remained to decide the question at issue. To avoid an open rupture or to gain time Charles still negotiated with Parliament for several months, and offered far-reaching concessions. He even signed the bill excluding the bishops from Parliament. Meanwhile both sides were arming. The queen sailed to Holland with her jewels to obtain money and warlike stores. When Parliament demanded the right of appointing the tutors of the royal children, the forcible education of the children of Catholics in the Protestant religion, and the sole command of the army, navy, militia and royal fortresses, the king withdrew to York. The earl of Essex was appointed commander of the parliamentary army. To him flocked the burgesses of the great towns, a large section of the middle class and the Puritans. They were nicknamed "Roundheads," from the Puritan fashion of closely clipping the hair. Charles set up the royal standard at Nottingham. The greater number of the landed gentry with their retainers and peasantry, and the members of the Established Church, answered his call. From their gay dress and deportment they were called Cavaliers. The Catholics to a man remained loyal to the king, turned their castles into fortresses and poured whatever money the penal laws had left them into the king's treasury. Out of 500 noblemen and gentlemen who fell in the course of the civil wars, 194 were Catholics.

Lingard, vol. 9, ch. 5; vol. 10, ch. 1. — S. R. Gardiner, vol. 7, pp. 123–391; vol. 8, 1635–39; vol. 9, 1639–41; vol. 10, 1641–42; *Student's Hist.:* vol. 2, ch. 32–34, pp. 514–536; *Epochs:* ch. 4–6, pp. 71–124. — Drane: *Charles I.*, pp. 462–479. — Green: Book 7, chs. 6–8. — Ranke: *History of England during the Seventeenth Century.* — *The Strafford Letters.* — May: *History of the Long Parliament.* — Forster: *The Grand Remonstrance; The Arrest of the Five Members.* — Guizot: *Charles I. and the Revolution.* — W. H. Hutton: *Willian Laud, by a Romish Recusant.* — C. H. Simpkinson: *Life and Times of William Laud.* — Traill: *Lord Strafford* (*Engl. Men of Action*). — Other *Lives* by Cooper; Forster (*Statesmen of the Commonwealth*); Forster-Browning: (*Emin. Brit. Statesmen*). — Zimmermann: *Karl I. und Cromwell, H. P. B.*, v. 14, p. 745, — Brodie: *Hist. of the Brit. Empire.*

§ 4.

THE CIVIL WAR.

509. The Battle of Edgehill and the Campaign of 1643. — The principal strength of the Parliament at the beginning of the war was in the southeast, that of the king in the northwest of England. Prince Rupert, the son of Elisabeth of England and the Winterking was the chief commander of the royalists whenever the king did not lead the army in person. Newcastle directed the operations in the north. The war opened with the battle of Edgehill,

1642. Whilst prince Rupert was driving the Roundhead cavalry in headlong flight before him, he nearly caused the loss of the battle by his absence from the main field of action. Essex, however, withdrew, and the king was able to push on to London. The city was defended by the militia or train-bands, and the king not daring to attack, lost his only chance of taking the capital.

Charles had chosen Oxford for his headquarters, where the royal Parliament held its sessions. Thither the fearless queen after her return from Holland led a small royalist army, 1643. The Cavaliers were fairly successful in the west. Bristol capitulated to prince Rupert, whilst Newcastle gained possession of Yorkshire and surrounding counties. The most furious engagement of the year was the first drawn battle of Newbury between Charles I. and Essex.

Five days after the battle of Newbury Parliament swore to a Solemn League and Covenant with Scotland, Pym's last work. It increased the parliamentary forces by an army of 20,000 Scotch Covenanters. Henceforth a Committee of Both Kingdoms, composed of members of Parliament and Scotch commissioners, controlled the operations of the respective armies. The first effect of this Presbyterian league was the universal destruction of religious emblems, wherever the Parliamentarians prevailed.

While royalism gained ground without winning a decisive advantage, a number of eastern counties banded together for mutual defense. This Eastern Association chose for its leader Oliver Cromwell, a member of Parliament for Cambridge, whose family had grown rich by the plunder of monasteries. He was a man who under the guise of stern Puritanism concealed a boundless ambition. To counteract the enthusiasm of Cavalier loyalty, he armed religious fanaticism against "the Philistines and men of Belial." He drilled his "godly" men, preached to them "prayed with them and fought with them, till his cavalry regiment, the Ironsides" surpassed in efficiency any other body of horse, Cavalier or Roundhead, in England.

510. The Campaign of 1644. — The chief theater of the campaign in 1644 was York and its surroundings. Newcastle had been forced to retreat from the siege of Hull to York. Before York gathered the invading army of the Scots under Alexander Leslie, now earl of Leven; the Parliamentarians under the Fairfaxes, father and son, and the army of the Eastern Association commanded by

Lord Manchester with Cromwell for his lieutenant-general. Charles dispatched prince Rupert from the western counties, where he had been engaged in a succession of brilliant actions, to the relief of York. At his approach the besiegers retreated. A desperate battle was fought on Marston Moor, in which the defeat of Fairfax and Leven was turned into a complete victory for the Parliamentarians by prince Rupert's hot pursuit of the fugitives, and Cromwell's steadiness and pluck. The battle of Marston Moor was followed by the fall of York and the virtual loss of Yorkshire to the king.

While in Yorkshire the king's cause was defeated, Charles followed Essex into Cornwall, where the whole parliamentary army was forced to surrender to him. Fairfax, Manchester, Waller and Cornwall, quarreling among themselves, joined their unwilling forces to intercept the king's army on its return from Cornwall. The result was the second undecisive battle of Newbury, from which the king retreated in order, while the Parliamentarian army became disorganized from desertions, want and sickness. Thus at the end of the year Charles entered Oxford in triumph behind a girdle of fortresses left intact by the parliamentary campaign.

511. The Final Campaign of 1645. — Meanwhile a champion of the king had appeared in Scotland, the earl of Montrose, a fiery enthusiast and a commander of extraordinary quickness and resort. Soon after the battle of Marston Moor he organized an army of Highlanders and Irish veterans. He dashed with lightning speed from one side of Scotland to the other, defeated Argyle in the very heart of his mountains, and crowned a series of successes by the victory of Kilsyth, where he annihilated a new army of 8,000 men levied by the Scottish Covenant (1644–45). In England while the early part of 1645 was passed in peace negotiations between the king and the Long Parliament, the two Houses reorganized the badly scattered and mutinous army under Sir Thomas Fairfax as general and Cromwell as lieutenant-general commanding the cavalry (the New Model). The superior numbers under Fairfax (14,000 Parliamentarians to 7,500 Royalists), the rashness of prince Rupert, who again forgot the lessons of Edgehill and Marston Moor, and the irresistible onset of Cromwell's Ironsides decided the war by the crushing defeat of Charles I. at Naseby. Charles with his fol-

lowers endeavored to join Montrose in Scotland, but before a juncture was possible, Montrose himself was defeated at Philiphaugh by David Leslie, another soldier of the Thirty Years' War

After the battle of Naseby, fortress after fortress was stormed by or surrendered to the Parliamentarian generals; in September Bristol fell; in April 1646, Exeter, the capital of the west, surrendered; in June Oxford; Raglan castle, the last royal post, surrendered in August, 1646. The prince of Wales joined his mother in France.

512. Religious Parties. — In the course of the Civil War three religious parties had been formed among the enemies of the king, which after the battle of Naseby, began to contend for supremacy. (a) The Scotch Presbyterians who wanted to establish the Presbyterian rule of the Puritan clergy, founded, as they claimed, on divine right.

(b) The English Presbyterians, who rejected any church system claiming to exist by divine right or by any right whatever independent of the authority of Parliament. With this party all church power was to be in the hands of lay committees subject to Parliament. Both parties were opposed to the sectarianism of the army.

(c) The Independents, led by Cromwell, who rejected altogether church authority. Every congregation was to be a free and independent church. They were the party of toleration of the most extreme and absurd opinions, while they bore a deadly hatred to king, prelates and Catholics.

Scotch Presbyterianism was represented by the Scotch Commissioners, the Scotch stationed in England, and a majority of the English clergy. The English Presbyterians had their strength in Parliament, and in the city of London. The army and the lower classes of the people, especially in the eastern counties, were Independents. In the reorganization of the army according to the "New Model," Cromwell had managed to exclude Essex, Manchester, Waller, and other Presbyterians from command. He looked upon his "Ironsides" as the "executioners of God's vengeance upon his enemies." Every captain, corporal or soldier "held forth" when the spirit seized him. Churches, taverns, streets were filled with the "noisy ranting, the wild incoherency of ignorant speech" flowing from the mouths of cobblers, tailors, felt-makers, women. The dreams, visions, and vagaries of the Anabaptists of Münster were revived among the lowest classes of Englishmen.

513. Charles I. a Prisoner. — After the fall of Essex Charles resolved to take refuge with the Scots. He was received with the outward honors of royalty but in reality guarded like a prisoner and finally sold to the Long Parliament for an army indemnity of 400,000*l*. Whilst being conveyed to Holmby House in Nottinghamshire he was everywhere greeted with warm manifestations of popular reverence and loyalty. When the troubles between the army and the Parliament began, Cromwell sent a squadron of horse to Holmby House who conducted the captive king to Hampton Court, now a prisoner of the army. After the failure of negotiations between the king and the rebels, Charles succeeded in making his escape from Hampton Court only to fall into the hands of colonel Hammond, a relative of Cromwell, by whom he was committed to close imprisonment at Carisbrooke Castle, Isle of Wight, whence he was removed to Hurst Castle, a lonely block house which at high tide was almost surrounded by the sea. When his death was resolved upon, Windsor Castle became his prison. In all his negotiations he had made up his mind, never to sacrifice the rights of his heirs, the safety of his friends, and the Anglican church which he conscientiously believed to represent the Church of Christ. He might have avoided many grave complications, had he fairly and publicly stated his position.

514. The "Second Civil War." — It was from Carisbrooke Castle that Charles concluded a secret "Engagement" with the Scots, in which he promised to acknowledge their form of Presbyterianism for three years, and to suppress the Independents and kindred sects, whilst the Scots were to restore him to the throne with the help of an invading army. When it became known that the Scots were on the point of crossing the border, a strong wave of royalism swept over the country. Four-fifths of the nation desired the restoration of the king and a settled government. In London, Kent, Essex, Surrey, Wales and many other counties, the people rose for the king. Fairfax was detailed to quell the outbreaks in the eastern counties. Cromwell put down the rising in Wales. Thence he marched northward and in the three days' battle at Preston defeated with 9,000 of his Ironsides the 24,000 Scots who had invaded England under the incapable Hamilton. At one stage of the battle Cromwell issued the order to massacre 10,000 captives in cold blood if the tide of success should turn against him. He pursued the fugitives into Scotland and dictated his terms at Edinburgh. In England the Roundheads signalized their success in the true Calvinist fashion by acts of savage ferocity.

515. The Struggle Between the Army and the Long Parliament. — The Parliament and the army began to measure arms, when the king had been delivered over to the parliamentary agents. The Presbyterian majority now undertook to disband the "new model," without paying the soldiers' arrears. The army thus challenged turned into a military Parliament, appointed committees of officers, chose agitators or agents, and began to send petitions, manifestoes, and remonstrances of open defiance to the Parliament. Cromwell first mediated, but finally placed himself at the head of the agitation, and took possession of the king. The army then demanded the expulsion of eleven Presbyterian leaders from the House. The House obeyed. But a Presbyterian mob of London broke into the House of Commons, reseated the eleven, and drove some 114 independent members into Cromwell's camp. Fairfax and Cromwell at once marched upon London, and occupied Westminster and the Tower.

The next demands for a democratic government and religious liberty for all except Catholics being rejected, a still more radical party, the Levellers or Rationalists, came to the front. They clamored for the head of the king and for a republican state. Cromwell's keen penetration was meanwhile carefully welding the trend of events. When he saw that the Levellers were to be the stronger party, he proclaimed a solemn fast in the army, and confessed with tears that hitherto "his eyes had not discovered the work of the Lord," but that now he was ready to stand or fall with the army. Thus by an act of his usual hypocrisy he made himself the leader of the Levellers. Having won the victory of Preston he was now ready to pursue his ambitious course with unrelenting energy. On December 5, the Presbyterian majority voted for a reconciliation with the king. Thereupon captain Pride, who had received his instructions, entered Parliament at the head of a body of Levellers, and gradually expelled "by the power of the sword" 143 Presbyterian members who favored the restoration of the king (Pride's Purge). Upon his return from Scotland Cromwell established his headquarters at Whitehall, the royal residence.

516. Trial and Execution of Charles I., 1649. — The mutilated House of Commons, now an abject tool in the hands of

the army, i. e., of Cromwell, passed a resolution that supreme authority resided in the House of Commons, that its laws are binding without the concurrent assent of the king and the House of Lords, appointed a high court of justice consisting of 135 commissioners to try Charles I. for treason in levying war against Parliament and the kingdom of England. To objections against the competency of this court Cromwell answered fiercely: "I tell you, we will cut off his head with the crown upon it." Not more than one-half of the commissioners attended the sessions; of these a bare majority voted for the execution, only twenty-eight signed the warrant in open court, and of these twelve afterwards asserted that they did so only under the threat of death. Fairfax who had never shared Cromwell's ferocious spirit took no part in the proceedings. Since Charles refused to recognize the competency of a court of his subjects, the trial was a mere formality, the sentence a judicial murder. On January 30 Charles I. sent his last message to his queen, and took leave of his two youngest children, the princess Elisabeth and the little duke of Gloucester, and with noble and fearless bearing ascended the scaffold erected before the window of the banquet room at Whitehall. His head fell at the first blow, and as the executioner lifted it to the sight of all, a groan of pity and horror burst from the hitherto silent multitude.

Lingard, vol. 10, *Charles I.*, chs. 2-4 (including, as elsewhere, the *Contemporary Hist. of Ireland*). — S. R. Gardiner: *History of the Great Civil War:* vol. 1, 1642-44; vol. 2, 1644-1645; vol. 3, 1645-1647; vol. 4, 1647-1649; *Student's Hist.:* vol. 2, chs. 34, 35, pp. 537-560; *Epochs:* ch. 7, pp. 127-153. — Drane: *Charles I.*, pp. 479-502. — Green, Book 7, ch. 9-10. — J. M. Stone: *Henrietta Maria Queen Consort of England:* D. R., '89, 2, p. 321. — W. D. Macray; Thomas Arnold: *Clarendon's History of the Rebellion and the Civil War.* — Eva Scott: *Rupert Prince Palatine.* — T. E. Gibson: *A Loyal Cath. Cavalier* (Wm Blundell of Crosby): M. '78, 3, pp. 164, 273, 412; '79, 1, p. 59. — W. Money: *The First and Second Battles of Newbury.* — Lieut.-Gen. W. G. Ross: *The Battle of Naseby;* E. H. R., vol. 3, p. 669. — Mowbray Morris: *Montrose.* — Mordock and Simpson, transl. and edit. *G. Wishart's Deeds of Montrose* (*The Memoirs of James Marquis of Montrose*). — Burnet: *Lives of the Hamiltons.* — J. Turner: *Memoir of the Scotch Invasion.* — *The Last Campaign of Montrose:* E. R. '94, 1, p. 122; '89, 2, p. 213 (on *Montrose*). — Weyman: *O. Cromwell's Kinsfolk:* E. H. R., v. 6, p. 48. — H. Hayman: *Cromwell:* D. R. '92, 3, p. 31. — W. G. Ross: *O. Cromwell and His Ironsides.* — Andrews: *Life of O. Cromwell to the Death of Charles I.* — *Fairfax Correspondence.* — A. Markham: *Life of Fairfax.* — A. Kingston: *East Anglia and the Civil War* (Eastern Association). — Sir Edw. Cust: *Lives of the Warriors of the Civil War.* — J. L. Sandford: *Studies and Illustrations of the Great Rebellion.*

§ 5.

IRELAND UNDER THE TUDORS AND STUARTS.

517. **Ireland under Henry VIII.** — The English Pale had in the course of time been reduced to the fortified towns on the seaboard with one-half of five counties. The rest of the country was divided among sixty Irish and thirty Anglo-Norman chiefs who had assumed Irish customs. Prominent among the former were the O'Neills of Tyrone, and the O'Donnells of Tirconnell; among the latter the Geraldines or Fitzgeralds, the Desmonds, Ormonds, etc. The population outside of the Pale was purely Celtic. The chiefs made war upon each other as if they were independent sovereigns. The imprisonment of the earl of Kildare, head of the Fitzgeralds, and his death in the Tower (1534) induced his son, Lord Thomas Fitzgerald, to declare himself the champion of the Catholics, and to rise against Henry VIII. But after the native troops had been defeated by English veterans, and the Geraldine castle at Maynooth battered down by English artillery, Sir Thomas submitted upon assurance of pardon and safety. The result was that not only Lord Thomas was taken to England and executed, but that his five uncles, three or whom had discountenanced the rising, were invited to a banquet, seized, manacled, sent to London and executed at Tyburn. Only a boy of twelve years, Lord Thomas' brother Gerald, was saved from this royal order of extermination. For his protection the O'Neills, O'Donnells, Desmonds and many others formed the first Geraldine League. He was restored to his titles and property under Edward VI. and queen Mary.

518. **Henry VIII. King of Ireland.** — After Fitzgerald's death the championship of the ancient faith was assumed by Archbishop Cromer of Armagh and the northern chieftain O'Neill. Then came the appointment by vicar-general Cromwell of his tool, George Brown, as archbishop of Dublin, the renewal of the legislation of Kilkenny (see no. 73) by a packed Parliament of the Pale, the suppression of 400 monasteries, whose property was confiscated for the king and his courtiers, or used as a corruption fund to bribe greedy chiefs into submission, and finally the proclamation of Henry VIII. as king of Ireland.

To express his complete severance from Rome, Henry changed the title, "Lord of Ireland," granted by Adrian IV. to Henry II., into that of the "King of Ireland." The Parliament, 1541, the first ever attended by Irish chiefs, acknowledged the new title. The native chieftains received English titles. Thus the O'Neill became earl of Tyrone, O'Donnell earl of Tirconnell. They swore fealty to Henry VIII., and consented to hold their lands by feudal tenure. In their oath they nominally acknowledged Henry's "supremacy." They did not understand one word of English, but remained as be-

fore in full communion with the Catholic priesthood, who of course were faithful to the Holy See. The nation as such made no submission whatever to Henry's religious pretensions.

519. **Ireland under Edward VI. and Mary Tudor.** — Under Edward the bishops were called upon to accept the new Protestant liturgy. Upon their scornful refusal Dowdal, Archbishop of Armagh, and other prelates, were expelled, and the vacant sees filled with Protestants of the most advanced type. But now, as under the former reign, the whole Irish nation clung passionately to their ancient faith. The priests, deprived of their holdings, continued to minister to the people. The only result of introducing the system of Cranmer was to unite all Ireland, within and without the Pale, against the crown. Under Mary Tudor Catholic worship was everywhere restored without the shedding of a drop of blood.

520. Ireland under Elisabeth. — There were three great insurrections in the reign of Elisabeth, chiefly caused by the attempts to force Protestantism upon the Irish nation and to rob the native owners of their land and give it to English and Irish colonists (Plantations). The first was the insurrection of Shane O'Neill, a prince who governed Tyrone with great strictness and justice. Driven into a rising by Elisabeth's duplicity, he was, after a successful career against the English, finally overthrown by his rivals, the O'Donnells (1562–1567). Next came the insurrection of the second Geraldine League of the Celtic and Anglo-Irish chiefs under Lord James Fitzmaurice Fitzgerald and the earl of Desmond, in defense of the Catholic religion and the Irish soil, 1567–1583. In 1579 a party of Spaniards subsidized by the Pope landed at Smerwick, Kerry, to assist the patriots. They were besieged by the English and after a hard struggle the survivors, about 600, surrendered at discretion and were all massacred as well as the women that were found in the fort. The rising was stamped out by the brutal devastations of Pelham and Ormond. The last insurrection was that of Hugh O'Neill, earl of Tyrone, and O'Donnell, earl of Tirconnell, 1593–1603. The perfidy of Lord Deputy W. Fitzwilliams in seizing and imprisoning chiefs and breaking his engagements with the Irish leaders gave it a national character. In 1598 O'Neill won the great victory of the Yellow Ford on the Blackwater, in which the English lost their general, nearly all their officers, 2,000 men with all their artillery, stores and ammunition, besides the fortresses of Armagh

and Portmore. Nearly all the castles of Desmond and his allies were recovered by the patriots. The expedition of the earl of Essex at the head of 20,000 men was a failure, 1599–1600. But with the arrival of Lord Montjoy the tide began to turn. In 1601 a Spanish expedition of 3,500 men landed at Kinsale and was joined by the northern earls. But they were surprised and defeated by Montjoy's army of 12,000 English. The earls were finally compelled to submit, and were reinstated. But a war of calumny and chicanery followed the war of battles and finally induced them to bid farewell forever to their native country, and to end their days with their families in Rome for whose faith they had so valiantly fought and suffered. Other leaders had accompanied the returning Spaniards, or settled in France, Austria and other Catholic countries, founding families that became renowned hereafter in the European councils of peace and war.

521. **Methods of English Warfare.** — The suppression of the Irish race in the wars against Shane O'Neill, the Geraldines and the northern earls was carried on with a ferocity hardly exceeded by any page in the bloodstained annals of the Turks. A favorite means of murdering prominent Irishmen was to invite them to a banquet. Thus on one occasion seventeen Irish gentlemen invited to supper by an English officer were all stabbed when they rose from the table. The earl of Essex improved upon the method. He *accepted* the hospitality of Sir Brien O'Neill. When the chief and his family had retired, he surrounded his house with soldiers, captured his host with his wife and brother, sent them to Dublin for execution, and massacred the whole body of his retainers. Archbishop Hurley before being sent to the gallows was tortured by roasting his feet with fire to extort a confession of treason. Five Catholic bishops perished either by execution or by the violence of soldiers, and the Primate died a prisoner in the Tower. The war as conducted by Carew, Gilbert, Pelham, Ormond, Montjoy, was literally a war of extermination. Not only the men, but the women, the children, boys and girls, blind and feeble men, sick persons, idiots and old people, were deliberately and systematically butchered. In Desmond's country, after all resistance had ceased, "soldiers forced men and women into old barns which were set on fire and if any attempted to escape they were shot or stabbed." Soldiers were seen "to take up infants on the point of their spears and to twirl them about in their agony." Women were found hanging on trees with their children, strangled by their mother's hair. Another method of extermination proved still more efficacious. "Year after year all means of human subsistence were destroyed, and the population skillfully and steadily starved to death." Large forces started out from Dublin with

sickles, scythes and harrows in addition to their arms to destroy the crops of whole districts. An English eyewitness reports: "No spectacle was more frequent in the ditches of towns and especially in wasted countries, than to see multitudes of these poor people dead with their mouths all colored green by eating nettles, docks and all things they could rend above ground." In the single county of Tyrone 3,000 persons in a few months perished by hunger. A high English official writing in 1582, computed that in six months 30,000 people had been starved to death in Munster. Long before the war had terminated Elisabeth was assured that she had little left to reign over but ashes and carcasses. Thus was English ascendency established in Ireland.

522. Ireland under the Stuarts—The Ulster Plantation.— Since the reign of Mary Tudor several attempts had been made to "plant" different parts of Ireland, i. e., to root out the native population and replace it by English and Scotch colonists. But it was the flight of the earls which opened the north of Ireland to the first successful wholesale confiscation, the Ulster Plantation. According to a plan drawn up by a commission in London under the advice of Bacon, the fertile lands of six counties of Ulster, amounting to more than half a million acres, were confiscated to the crown to be distributed among new settlers. The "undertakers" received lots of 2,000 acres each, on which no *Irish* tenants were allowed. The "servitors," civil and military employees, received 1,500 acres each on which no *Catholic* tenants were allowed. Lots of 1,000 acres of the poorest soil might be taken up indiscriminately by English or Irish, Catholics or Protestants. Thus 58,000 acres, about one-ninth of the confiscated land, were left to the old Irish owners. The great mass of the Irish were ordered to depart with their movables "wherever they pleased" that is unto the barren hills, glens and bogs. The proprietary rights of the clans were entirely disregarded.

A new order of "baronets" was founded for the purpose of building forts and of maintaining thirty soldiers on their lands to keep out the Irish. To procure a permanent Protestant majority in the Irish Parliament, spurious burroughs were created, little hamlets with only a few inhabitants, each to return two members. Thus the real owners of the soil became the slaves of aliens who were the enemies of their race and religion. The majority of the new settlers belonged to the scum of the English and Scotch population, fugitives of justice, adventurers, murderers and other disreputable characters.

In the execution of the scheme, the commissioners appointed to distribute the lands, scandalously abused their trusts and by fraud and violence deprived the natives of the possessions the king had reserved for them. The legal proceeding during the rest of James I.'s reign became an infamous mockery of justice. The country swarmed with persons called discoverers, who for a reward in land or money swore away the property rights of the lawful owners. In this way minor plantations were effected in Wexford, Leinster, and other parts of the country.

523. Ireland under Wentworth. — The legal frauds for the purpose of spoliation rose to gigantic proportions under the administration of Wentworth (1633–40). Whilst promoting in several ways the material prosperity of the country and enforcing order, he extorted enormous sums for the king from Catholics and Protestants in return for promised royal graces, of which the most important were security of land titles and freedom of Catholic worship. But in distinct violation of the king's solemn promise he withdrew the principal graces as soon as the money was in his hands. To break the titles confirmed by the crown, he threatened, punished, and imprisoned sheriffs, juries and lawyers, and thus confiscated nearly all Connaught, the whole of Clare, and a large part of Tipperary with the intention of planting them. But the king's precarious position in England, and the fear of an Irish insurrection, induced him to postpone the plantation.

M. R. P. Moran: *Historical Sketches of Persecution in Ireland; Spicilegium Ossoriense: A Collection of Original Letters and Papers Illustrative of the Hist. of the Irish Church*, vol. 1, 1537–1640, pp. 1–252. — Th. A. M'Gee: *Hist. of the Attempts to Establish the Protestant Reformation in Ireland.* — B. J. Clinch: *First Century of Religious Persecution in Ireland*, A. C. Q., v. 10, p. 269. — P. W. Joyce: *A. Short Hist. of Ireland* (till 1608); Part 4: *The Period of Insurrection, Confiscation and Plantation*, pp. 390–548.— Th. Burke: *English Misrule in Ireland.* — Lingard: *From Henry VIII. to Charles I.* passim. — P. O'Kelly-MacGeoghegan: *Hist. of Ireland*, chs. 33–51. — S. R. Gardiner: *Hist of Engl., etc.*, v. 1 (from Henry VIII. -1616), ch. 9; *Ulster Plantation*, vol. 2, ch. 18, pp. 283–302; vol. 8, chs. 75–76. — W. Mazière-Brady: *State Papers Concerning the Irish Church in the Time of Elisabeth.*— O'Reilly: *Memorials of Those who Suffered for the Cath. Faith in Ireland* (to Elisabeth). — R. Bagwell: *Ireland under the Tudors.* — E. Hogan, S. J.: (ed.) *The Description of Ireland and the State Thereof in 1598.* —R. Dunlop: *The Plantation of Leix and Offaly*, E. H. R., v. 6, p. 61; *The Plantation of Munster, 1584–89*, E. H. R., v. p. 250. — D. Murphy, S. J.: *The Plantation of Desmond*, A. C. Q., v. 3, p. 482. — C. P. Meehan: *The Fate and Fortunes of Hugh O'Neill, Earl of Tyrone, and Rory O'Donnell, Earl of Tirconnell.*— W. F. Dennahy: *Catholicity in Ireland under James I.* — Edm. Hogan, S. J.: *Distinguished Irishmen in the Sixteenth Century.*— W. E. H. Lecky: *A History of England*, v. 2, ch. 6; *Ireland before the Eighteenth Century*, pp. 101–135; *Annals of the Four Masters* (under respective dates).— Brenan: *Eccl. Hist. of Ireland.*

§ 6.

THE INSURRECTION OF 1641.

524. Causes of the Great Insurrection. — (a) The horrors of the Elisabethan wars and of the Ulster plantation and the iniquities of Wentworth's administration made it clear to the Irish people, that no submission on their part and no promises on the part of the government could avert the doom of their being "rooted out of the soil."

(b) The Plantations were undertaken to destroy what the nation valued even more than their land, viz., the Catholic religion, to which the whole people remained sincerely attached.

(c) A new and terrible danger approached from another quarter, the Puritan Parliament of England, which drove every Catholic officer from the army, and applied to the king to confiscate two-thirds of the lands of the Catholics, to send every priest to the gallows, and to absolutely suppress Catholicism in the whole island.

(d) They were positively goaded into a general insurrection by the lords-justices repeatedly and publicly stating, that the more they were in rebellion, the more lands would be forfeited. In vain the Catholics, nine-tenths of whom remained always loyal to the *king*, negotiated with Charles I., and offered him armed assistance. They were first encouraged by the agents of the king, then they were disappointed by his vacillation and subjected to new cruelties, until no hope remained but that of armed self-defense. Accordingly the Irish leaders, Sir Roger O'Moore, Sir Phelim O'Neill, Lord Maguire and others resolved on a rising.

525. The Outbreak in Ulster. — The insurrection broke out October 22, 1641, in the counties of Ulster, from which the people had been so cruelly expelled in the former reign. Whilst the insurgents were baffled in their plan of taking Dublin, nearly all Ulster was in their hands at the end of a week, and Sir Phelim had an army of 30,000 men. Everywhere the new settlers were driven from their ill-gotten homes. It was the character of the Plantation which gave the rising in Ulster its agrarian character.

It is an often occurring statement of partisan writers that the Ulster rising began with a general and indiscriminate slaughter of the Protestants.*

The statement of a sudden surprise and organized massacre is utterly and absolutely untrue. There were in the first outbreak very few murders and

* Clarendon asserted that there were 40,000 or 50,000 English Protestants murdered before they suspected any danger; other writers (Hume, Temple) estimated the victims of the Ulster rising at 150,000, 200,000 and even 300,000, that is to say 100,000 more than were living in all Ireland.

nothing whatever in the nature of a massacre. Sir Phelim issued a proclamation pronouncing penalty of death against any who committed outrages. Numbers of Protestants were sheltered by the mother of Sir Phelim. The whole Catholic clergy opposed acts of violence and saved and protected numerous Protestants. When the rising of Ulster was in its height and castle after castle had to capitulate, the terms of capitulation were in many cases scrupulously observed. Thousands of English were escorted to places of safety by the Irish. That four or five hundred were slain and twice as many died of exposure in different parts of the country and at different times of the rising, however deplorable and unjustifiable, is only too natural in a rising which offered unbounded opportunities for the private revenge of an outraged people. On the other hand the Scottish garrison of Carrickfergus, in November, 1641, slaughtered a great number of harmless people in the island Magee, where there had been no disturbance of any kind. In the very first months the soldiers killed hundreds of ill-armed insurgents without losing one man on their own side. The numbers of the Irish who were slain all over the country in places where there had been no rising at all, far exceeded those of the settlers that had fallen victims in Ulster. Sir Charles Coote, St. Leger, Hamilton rivaled the worst crimes of Carew, Pelham and Montjoy. Their soldiers introduced the saying, "nits make lice," to justify the murder of Irish children. Compared with the atrocities of the enemy committed before, during and after the great insurrection, the excesses of Ulster sink into insignificance.

526. The National War. — The rising of Ulster in October was a sudden outburst of wrath. It was not before the English House of Commons in December voted for the extirpation of Popery, that the Catholic gentry of all Ireland, in and out of the Pale, were reluctantly driven to arms. Outside of Ulster, it was primarily a war of defense, undertaken for the purpose of securing the untrammeled exercise of the Catholic religion. The old Irish who fought under Owen Roe O'Neill, the nephew of the great earl of Tyrone, aimed at a total separation from England as the best guarantee for their faith and property. The Anglo-Irish Catholics fighting under Colonel Preston, brother of Lord Gormanstown, wanted religious and civil liberty without separation from England. The royalist party that held Dublin were Anglicans who fought solely for the royal cause. The Puritans of England and the Covenanters of Scotland under General Monro, were the most determined foes both of the Catholics and the king.

Owen Roe O'Neill and Preston landed from the continent in 1642, the former with 100, the latter with 500 officers. O'Neill condemned the excesses

committed in Ulster, punished the evil-doers whom he could reach, sent the English prisoners to a place of safety, and introduced a strict discipline among his followers. He had learned the science of war and won the highest distinction in the Spanish service. In Ireland he fought the English in forty battles, and suffered only one defeat. No breach of honor, no inhumanity ever sullied his victories, though the English were ordered to give no quarter, to make no distinction between the innocent and guilty and to kill every priest they met.

Like Owen Roe all the Irish leaders did their utmost, and in most cases successfully, to restrict the horrors of war and to prevent devastation.

The Puritan Parliament made the subjection of Ireland a matter of speculation. Whosoever would subscribe 600*l.* for this purpose was to receive 1,000 acres of forfeited lands in Leinster; or for smaller sums the same amount of land in Munster, Connaught or Ulster. This monstrous scheme of confiscation, assigning 2,500,000 acres to the subscribers, passed both Houses without opposition, and received the assent of the king. The outbreak of the civil war in England made it impossible to send any considerable forces to Ireland.

527. The Irish Confederation, 1642. — To effect a stronger union, all the Catholic elements met in convention and formed the Confederation of Kilkenny, while the bishops and clergy assembled in the National Synod of Kilkenny. The Synod declared the war against the English Parliament for the defense of the Catholic religion and the maintenance of the royal rights just and holy, emphatically condemned the excesses of Ulster and excommunicated all Catholics who should for the future be guilty of such acts. The whole army should receive the sacraments once a month and always before battle. Confederation and Synod united formed the General Assembly of the Confederate Catholics, under the motto: "Pro Deo, Rege et Patria Hiberni Unanimes." They resolved to send ambassadors to the Pope and the kings of France and Spain. The Assembly appointed a Supreme Council vested with executive power, and offered the king an army of 10,000 men for the permission to open a Parliament at Dublin mainly composed of Catholics. What they obtained from the wavering king, was a cessation of arms, which left the coast-line from Belfast to Dublin and Cork, with its immediate surroundings to the English forces, Carrickfergus to the Scots under

Monro, all the rest of Ireland to the Confederates. The Protestant earl of Ormond, a Butler, was named by the king lieutenant of Ireland residing at Dublin. He became Ireland's evil genius, 1642–44.

528. Glamorgan in Ireland. — In 1645 Charles I. sent the earl of Glamorgan to Ireland as his special envoy. Glamorgan was an English Catholic in whom chivalrous devotion to the king's person was blended with no less chivalrous devotion to his Church. He and his father, the marquis of Worcester, had aided the king to the amount of 2,500,000*l*. Glamorgan had almost unlimited but secret powers to treat with the Pope, the Catholic princes and the Supreme Council of the Irish Confederates, and to levy troops in Ireland and on the Continent. The Irish Confederates demanded the free and public exercise of the Catholic religion, the guaranteed possession of all the churches, which were not actually in Protestant hands, and complete liberation from all ecclesiastical jurisdiction not derived from the Catholic Church within the territory held by the General Assembly. Glamorgan granted nearly all the Catholic demands in a secret treaty, while the Supreme Council engaged itself to furnish him 10,000 men to be employed by him for the king in England.

529. Glamorgan Disavowed. — Innocent X. appointed Rinuccini, Archbishop of Fermo, a prelate of resolute character and great ability, as his nuncio in Ireland. Rinuccini arrived in the autumn with money and ammunition for the Irish cause. Upon his arrival Glamorgan made some further religious concessions. Copies of his secret treaty fell into the hands of Ormond and the English Parliament. The Royal Council at Dublin committed Glamorgan to prison and referred the matter to the king. The Commons in London published the Glamorgan treaty, and furiously attacked the king. The king, in his false way, disavowed all the powers he had given to Glamorgan, except that of levying troops, and handed the Irish Catholics over to the mercy of the Puritan Parliament.

530. **Rinuccini and Owen Roe O'Neill.** — Rinuccini labored consistently in upholding the religious and civil rights of the Irish people, and found his most faithful supporter in Owen Roe O'Neill. No settlement was deemed satisfactory by the thorough Catholics led by the nuncio and Owen Roe unless it secured absolute freedom of worship not only for individuals

but for the Church, the restoration of the ancient rights and the restitution of the planted soil to its natural and lawful owners.

In June, 1646, Owen Roe O'Neill won with inferior numbers the splendid victory at Benburb over the English and Scots under Monro, who in the taking of Sligo had murdered men, women and children; 3,000 Scots remained on the field and many more were slain in pursuit. The victory was quickly followed by further successes of the Irish army. Under these circumstances Ormond, whose usual policy was to sow dissensions among the Catholics, published a treaty of peace, which he had secretly concluded with the Supreme Council after Glamorgan's public disavowal by the king. A number of influential members of the Supreme Council were attached to the Protestant Ormond by ties of affinity or self-interest. In this peace Ormond and the Supreme Council waived the religious demands of the Catholics and secured only political advantages. The nuncio, the clergy, and the greater part of the army, and all the earnest Catholic laymen, rejected this surrender of the main question in Ireland. The National Synod at Waterford excommunicated the adherents of the anti-Catholic peace. Owen Roe O'Neill declared against the Supreme Council, which had proclaimed him, the greatest Catholic hero of Ireland, a traitor. Ormond had summoned a meeting of the nobility to Cashel. Cashel and other cities closed their gates against him. While Ormond retreated discomfited to Dublin, Rinuccini entered Kilkenny at the head of an armed force. The leaders of the Supreme Council were arrested and a new Council chosen of which Rinuccini was appointed president. The General Assembly meeting in 1647 condemned Ormond's peace and swore not to accept a peace in which the rights of the Church were not all secured. Ormond in his bitter hatred of the Catholic Church handed over Dublin to the parliamentary commissioners and troops arriving from England under Jones, and left Ireland.

531. A Disastrous Year, 1647. — The year 1647 was a disastrous one for the whole of Ireland. Preston, the commander of the Confederates of Leinster, was signally defeated at Dungan Hill by Jones, and lost 3,000 men in the field and nearly 3,000 fugitives who had taken refuge in a bog. Lord Inchiquin, the deadly foe of his Catholic compatriots, known among the Irish as "the scourge of God," and "Morrough of the Burnings," ravaged in Munster, massacred a thousand persons in St. Patrick's Cathedral at Cashel, de-

stroyed nearly the whole city, and followed up these feats by a victory over the Confederates at Mallow. In the north the Parliamentarians, Jones and Monk effected a union and took many fortresses.

532. Departure of Rinuccini and Return of Ormond. — The spirit of dissension, the bane of Ireland, that divided the Confederates, entered the ranks of the bishops and clergy, caused the gradual loss of the great advantages hitherto gained, and induced Rinuccini to return to Italy. In 1648 Ormond returned to Ireland with new instructions of the king, entered into close alliance with the Catholic lords and concluded, in 1649, a peace with the General Assembly, granting the Catholics freedom of worship without prejudice to their persons and estates, substituting for the oath of supremacy an oath of allegiance, and vacating all acts of Parliament in dishonor of the Catholic faith. The Assembly promised him 17,000 men and corresponding subsidies. But only a small portion of men and means could be obtained in the exhausted and divided state of the country. Accordingly Ormond's attempt to retake Dublin from the Parliamentarians, to whom he had surrendered it, was a complete failure. A few days after the signing of the treaty the news of the king's execution arrived in Ireland, and the prince of Wales was proclaimed king as Charles II., whilst the English Parliament appointed Oliver Cromwell lord lieutenant and commander of the forces in Ireland.

P. O'Kelly-MacGeoghegan: *Hist. of Ireland*, ch. 51. — W. A. O'Conor: *Hist. of the Irish People*, Book 3. — M. Haverty: *Hist. of Ireland.* — Curry: *Review of the Civil Wars in Ireland.* — Prendergast: *Cromwellian Settlement.* — Lord Castlehaven: *Memoirs.* — Warner: *History of the Rebellion.* — Carte: *Life of Ormond.* — Lord Clanricarde: *Memoirs.* — *The Hist. of the Wars in Ireland from 1641–53:* by a British officer (contemporary). — Lingard (*under Charles II.*) — Gardiner: vol. 8, chs. 75 and 76. — Joyce: *A Child's Hist. of Ireland*, chs. 44–45. — John T. Gilbert: *History of the Irish Confederation* (original sources); ed.: *A Contemporary Hist. of Affairs in Ireland from 1641–1652.* — *Spicilegium Ossoriense*, vol. 1, pp. 254–325. — Lecky, vol. 2, pp. 129–186. — S. R. Gardiner: *Charles I. and the Earl of Glamorgan:* E. H. R., v. 2. p. 687. — G. Aiazza-A. Hutton: *The Embassy in Ireland of Mgr. G. B. Rinuccini, Archb. of Fermo*, 1645–49. — *Rinuccini's Irish Nunciature:* D. R., '74, 2, 424.

§ 7.

CROMWELL IN IRELAND.

533. Cromwell in Ireland, 1649. — In August, 1649, Oliver Cromwell landed in Dublin at the head of 13,000 veterans,

well supplied with artillery, money and provisions. Whilst stabling the troopers' horses in St. Patrick's Cathedral, he exhorted the citizens to godliness, and forbade his army by proclamation to slay or harass non-combatants. He then marched north. The first town stormed by Cromwell was Drogheda (September 10). The garrison fought with extreme courage. Till the last position was taken, the officers gave quarter. As soon as the whole town was in their power, Cromwell's orders went around: "no quarter." As victims of this treason Sir Arthur Ashton, the governor, had "his brains beat out and his body hacked to pieces," thirty-four higher officers, 2,500 foot, the flower of the Irish army, were massacred. No mercy was shown in the five days of the massacre, either to the women, or to the aged or the young. Cromwell's calculation was verified: the terror of his name spread like wildfire. A number of places at once surrendered. Cromwell returned to Dublin, and marching south appeared before the strongly fortified city of Wexford. The forts between Dublin and Wexford had easily fallen into his hands. Dissension and treachery opened the gates of Wexford. The castle was yielded up by its captain Stafford, — one of the four commissioners chosen by the townsmen to treat with the English general — and occupied by Cromwell's soldiers, while the terms of surrender were still under consideration. The scenes of Drogheda were renewed at Wexford. Many priests, some religious, 2,000 soldiers and innumerable citizens were massacred, whilst Cromwell lost "not twenty from first to last." The report of the slaughter of 300 virgins around the Wexford cross rests on local and general tradition, and was for the first time recorded in writing in 1758 (by Abbé M'Geoghegan).

Ross surrendered without resistance. Here Cromwell contented himself with plundering the churches and suppressing the Mass. In Cork and most of the fortified towns of Munster the Protestant royalists sold their loyalty to Cromwell and the Puritan Parliament, and drove out their Irish comrades. In Cork all the Catholics, noble and simple, merchants and citizens, were left the alternative of turning Puritans or leaving the city under penalty of being massacred with the total loss of their property. The Catholics of Cork to the last man preferred misery and exile to apostasy.

Thus Cromwell obtained ample winter quarters and the means of always communicating with England, while the last hopes of the royalists still serving under the marquis of Ormond were destroyed.

In his letter about the storming of Drogheda Cromwell noticed it as a special instance of Divine Providence, that in the great church of St. Peter, where the Catholics had celebrated Mass on the previous Sunday, "near 1,000 of them were put to the sword fleeing thither for safety. All their friars were knocked on the head promiscuously but two" who were taken prisoners and killed. "When the soldiers made their way up to the lofts and galleries of the church and up to the tower, each of the assailants took up a child and used it as a buckler of defense to keep themselves from being shot or brained." When they had dispatched the fugitives in the church and tower they went into the vault "where all the flower and choicest of the women and ladies had hid themselves" and massacred them. Thus relates Thomas Wood, who was himself engaged in the massacre, to his brother Anthony, the well-known historian of Oxford. About these scenes Cromwell writes to the Council of State: "And now give me leave to say how it comes to pass that this work is wrought. It was set upon some of our hearts that a great thing should be done, not by power or might, but by the spirit of God. And therefore it is good that God alone have all the glory."

534. Cromwell's Campaign in 1650.—Cromwell took the field in January and within two months subdued every place of importance except Waterford, Limerick, Clonmel, Galway and Kilkenny. Whole royalist regiments disbanded or signed articles with him. Notwithstanding the reinforcement which he had drawn from Dublin, he almost despaired of taking Kilkenny. The city was splendidly defended by Butler, who repelled four storming attacks of all the English forces. Cromwell was on the point of raising the siege, when the cowardice of the citizens and the treachery of the mayor forced the gallant governor to surrender the castle. The city was spared a general pillage, but everything sacred was desecrated or destroyed. Most gallant was the defense of Clonmel, conducted for two months by Hugh O'Neill, the nephew of Owen Roe, who had died November 6, 1649, whilst preparing to march south. Cromwell lost 2–3,000 of his best men and officers. When ammunition and provisions began to fail, O'Neill withdrew with his clansmen, advising the mayor to treat. Cromwell was fair enough to stand

by the favorable terms, which he had offered before, and to commend the gallantry of the defenders.

535. Final Subjugation of Ireland. — The danger on the side of Scotland, where a rising in favor of the prince of Wales was preparing, induced Parliament to recall Cromwell. He handed over the command of the army to his son-in-law, Ireton, who had been his major-general. By him and his fellow-generals Waterford, Limerick, Galway, and the rest of Ireland were reduced. The Ulster army, commanded by Heber MacMahon, bishop of Clogher, and still numbering over 5,000 men, was destroyed at Scariffhollis by the Puritan general, the younger Sir Charles Coote. Sir Phelim O'Neill and the best blood of the North, spared on the battlefield, died on the scaffold. Ireton was carried off by the pestilence after the taking of Limerick, and succeeded by Ludlow, to whom the remainders of the Irish army surrendered in January, 1652.

According to the calculation of Sir William Petty, out of a population of 1,460,000, 616,000 had in eleven years perished by the sword, by plague, or by famine artificially produced. Of these 504,000 were Irish, 112,000 of English extraction. The population was still further cut down by the Cromwellian settlement.

536. The Cromwellian Settlement, 1653–59. — The Cromwellian Settlement allowed the Irish soldiers to take service with foreign princes in amity with the Commonwealth. Between 1652 and 54, 34,000 "swordmen" left Ireland for Spain, France, the Netherlands and other countries beyond the Channel. The government reserved for themselves the four counties of Dublin, Kildare, Carlow and Cork, all the towns of Ireland, and all the church lands and tithes; for they abolished all archbishops, bishops, deans and other ecclesiastical dignities.

The gigantic plantation scheme of the Cromwellian Settlement divided Ireland into three portions. One was to be a purely Protestant plantation, admitting besides the English, Dutch, Swiss, or other Protestant foreigners, provided they were opposed to the Irish. The land on the eastern side of the kingdom, rendered nearly an island by the sea, the Boyne and the Barrow, was chosen for this

purpose. For the second or purely Irish plantation Connaught and County Clare were chosen, the most barren and wasted portion of Ireland. Surrounded all but ten miles by the sea and the Shannon the erection of a few forts made it most suitable for the purposes of imprisonment. Thither practically the whole Irish nation, Protestants who had shown zeal in the royal cause included, were condemned to emigrate by an act of Parliament of 1653 ("to hell or Connaught"). Only a few who had never been in arms, besides young boys and girls, who were to be brought up as Protestants, were exempted from transplantation. The third was to be a mixed plantation of English landlords and masters with a permission to take a limited number of Irish tenants and servants as ploughmen, tradesmen and laborers. All the Catholic inhabitants of cities and towns had to be transferred to Connaught. By this scheme of injustice and brutality, unparalleled in the history of Christian nations, 5,000,000 acres of Irish soil were taken from the owners and distributed among Cromwell's unpaid soldiers and English adventurers. "Slave-dealers were let loose upon the land and many hundreds of boys and marriageable girls were torn away from their country, shipped to Barbadoes," and Virginia and sold as slaves to the planters. Every Catholic Irishman trying to leave Connaught, who was found on the left bank of the Shannon after May 1, 1654, might be put to death by whoever met him. Ireland after Cromwell's invasion lay void as a wilderness. Women and children were found daily in ditches, starved. The bodies of many wandering orphans, whose fathers had embarked for Spain, and whose mothers had died of famine, were preyed upon by wolves. These beasts of prey increased to such an alarming extent, that the government had to set the price of £5 on the head of a wolf. The same price was set on the head of a Catholic priest. The prelates were chased from the country; the clergy exiled on a notice of twenty-eight days. It required all the heroism of the Catholic priesthood for pastors to remain in all manner of disguises in forests, bogs and caves with their stricken flocks. No wonder that the more impatient members of the down-trodden race gathered into bands of so-called Tories, who, breaking forth from the mountains, committed acts of lawlessness, drove away the cattle of the intruders, or perpetrated occa-

sional murders. The hopeless impoverishment of parts of Ireland dates from the Cromwellian Settlement.

Denis Murphy, S. J.: *Cromwell in Ireland.* — John P. Prendergast: *The Cromwellian Settlement of Ireland* (best work on the question). — Most Rev. Dr. Moran: *Persecution of Irish Catholics under the rule of Cromwell and the Puritans.* — *Spicilegium Ossoriense*, vol. 1, pp. 325–428. — Lecky, vol. 2, pp. 186–190. — Carlyle: *Life and Letters of Cromwell.*— Lingard: (*under Cromwell and Protectorate*). — Th. Burke: *English Misrule in Ireland* (*Cromwellian Era*). — Firth: *The Memoirs of Edw. Ludlow.* — *Life of Anthony Wood* (prefixed to the *Athenae Oxoniensis*). — *The Settlement of Ireland under Cromwell*, M. v. 3, p. 394 (old series). — S. R. Gardiner: *The Transplantation to Connaught*, E. H. R., v. 14, p. 700; *History of the Commonwealth and Protectorate*, vol. 1, chs. 1–6 (*Cromwell in Ireland*); vol. 2, ch. 19 (*subjugation of Ireland*); vol. 3, ch. 44 (*Cromwellian Settlement*). — Bellesheim: *Geschichte der Katholischen Kirche in Ireland;* vol. 2. — Works quoted in preceding §§.

§ 8.

THE COMMONWEALTH AND PROTECTORATE.

537. The Commonwealth. — England, after the murder of the king, was virtually a republic. Of its Parliament only the Rump remained, as people called the fifty odd members attending the Commons. On March 17, 1649, the monarchy was formally abolished, on May 19th the Commonwealth established. A Council of State consisting of forty-one members, officers and Parliamentarians, wielded all the executive power at home and abroad. The nation at large repudiated the army's work. It needed all the power of the army, and the iron ruthlessness of Cromwell, who had to cut down some of his own mutinous regiments, to maintain the new order of things. The prince of Wales was proclaimed as Charles II. in Ireland and Scotland. In Scotland he signed the Covenant and, though much against his will, pledged himself never to permit the free exercise of the Catholic religion in Ireland or any other part of his dominions, although in a declaration from Breda he had promised to restore the Irish Catholics "to their respective possessions and hereditaments." He further promised to recognize the authority of the recent Parliaments, and to govern according to the advice of Parliament and Kirk. An army of Scotch royalists took the field. Cromwell, just returning from the conquest of Ireland, defeated them near Dunbar on Scotch ground, 1650, and a new army at Worcester on English soil, 1651. The fugitive Charles after a series of hairbreadth escapes landed on the south coast of Normandy.

538. The Navigation Act, 1651. — The one act of lasting importance passed during Cromwell's rule was the Navigation Act. It grew out of the commercial jealousy between England and the Dutch, who had the best mercantile vessels of the world. With the death of William II. of Orange the Stadtholdership was abolished and the United Provinces were ruled by the merchants of Amsterdam and Rotterdam. The Navigation Act prohibited to all foreigners the importation in their own ships of all but their own products. The Act crippled the carrying trade of Holland and resulted in a war with the Dutch Republic. The two admirals, Blake and Tromp, were well matched. Many naval engagements with varying success were fought, but no decisive battle. By the Peace of London the United Provinces recognized the supremacy of the English flag in the British seas, and submitted to the Navigation Act. Cromwell's next object of attack was Spain, against which he harbored a fanatical hatred, though Spain had long ago ceased to be dangerous to England. His demand of free trade in the West Indies was refused by the Spanish court. Accordingly Cromwell, in 1655, sent out two fleets with secret orders. One under Blake destroyed the Mohammedan pirate fleet in the harbor of Algiers, but failed to capture the Spanish treasure fleet as ordered. The second under Venables sailed to the West Indies; but its descent upon San Domingo was successfully repelled: only Jamaica, considered of little importance, was taken. Both Blake and Venables were for a time thrown into the Tower. These failures drove Cromwell into an alliance with France, then at war with Spain. Six thousand English troops assisted the French in the battle of the Dunes. Dunkirk was captured and handed over to Cromwell as the price for his assistance. (See no. 485.)

539. Cromwell's Growing Power. — The attempt of the Rump to reduce the number of the army and the power of the officers led to a quarrel between Cromwell, who demanded a dissolution, and the Parliament which refused to dissolve; accordingly Cromwell, on April 20, 1653, when the House was passing a bill, entered the Chamber and calling in two files of musketeers, drove the members with scorn and ignominy from the House and dissolved the Council of State. Thus at length every political institution, King, Lords and Commons, was leveled to the ground. The sword alone ruled. The new Council of State consisted of eight officers and four

civilians with Cromwell as their head. Both Cromwell and his officers knew, that a freely elected Parliament would sweep the Commonwealth and Puritanism from the face of England and recall the king. The new Parliament, which from one of its members, Praise-God Barebones, received the name of the Barebones' Parliament, was not elected but appointed by Cromwell and his officers, "Persons fearing God and of approved fidelity and honesty, chosen (says his Proclamation) by myself with the advice of my Council of officers." They were a lot of impracticable fanatics, with a minority of able and respectable members. They were to rule England not under a constitution but upon the ground of their godliness. Outside of this Parliament a still more fanatical sect, the Fifth-Monarchy men, clamored for recognition and terrified all who had any property to lose. A minority in the quarreling Parliament got up early one morning, declared the Barebones' Parliament dissolved and handed over supreme power to Cromwell as Lord Protector of England.

540. Cromwell's Protectorate. — The constitution of the Protectorate was embodied in the "Instrument of Government," a private document drawn up by Cromwell himself and his friends. It gave to Cromwell quasi-royal power, a fixed revenue for government expenses and the right of appointing state officials. His power was restricted only by an irremovable Council of State, and a Puritan Parliament of one House. Cromwell himself lived in regal state at Whitehall. Army generals of republican proclivities, though his former friends, were sent to prison. The members of the first Protectorate Parliament, meeting in September, 1654, were forced at the point of the sword to declare their personal allegiance to Cromwell. When they, nevertheless, attempted to modify the "Instrument," they were promptly dissolved in January, 1655. The regicide Protector now entered on the policy of the murdered king. In spite of the resistance of both the people and the judges he levied taxes at will without Parliament. To make his hold on supreme power still stronger, he divided England into ten military districts and set a major-general with arbitrary power over each to maintain order, and to enforce the payment of ten per cent of the entire income of the royalists, because they had shown some signs of restlessness.* The religious policy of the Protectorate had been heretofore toleration for Puritan sects, local connivance at private Episcopalian ser-

* The so-called royalist conspiracies of 1654 and 55 were artificially fostered by Cromwell himself.

vice, and merciless proscription of the Catholics. The private Episcopalian worship was now suppressed. The Protectorate had changed into a military despotism.

541. Cromwell's Second Parliament, 1656. — To obtain money for his war with Spain Cromwell summoned a new Parliament. It was chosen under the pressure exercised by the major-generals. At its first meeting he excluded 100 members as unfriendly to himself. The rest voted the required subsidies, and Cromwell withdrew the major-generals. Parliament, then frightened by a plot against Oliver's life, thought a return to earlier constitutional forms, some substitute for lords and king, necessary for England's security. It therefore passed the "Humble Petition and Advice" providing for an Upper House and offering the royal title to Cromwell. The existing Parliament was to be increased by the admission of the 100 rejected members, whilst the most prominent friends of Oliver were to enter the Upper House. Now, although Cromwell had expressed his desire for the kingship as early as 1651 and clearly expressed it now in the long deliberations held about this matter, the outspoken opposition of the army frightened him out of the coveted prize, and he refused the crown "for this time." The rest of the Humble Petition he accepted. The removal of his warmest friends to the Upper House, and the return of the 100 members opposed to him to the Lower House, destroyed the Cromwellian majority in the Commons and he dissolved his second Parliament, 1658.

542. Cromwell's Last Days. — Cromwell's splendor as Protector was but a "gloomy splendor." Gradually all his friends fell away from him. Numerous plots to murder him were formed both by royalists and republicans. He always went armed and wore a coat of mail beneath his state robes. He had covered England with a network of spies. Twelve thousand persons were under arrest for political reasons. His mainstay, the army itself, was disaffected. He became restless, could not sleep, frequently changed his sleeping room, kept secret passages and means of exit, and appointed a special body-guard. His anxieties brought on a fever, and he died September 30, the day of Dunbar and Worcester, 1658.

543. Cromwell's Character. — With Cromwell died a character whom the royalist Clarendon styled "a great, bad man." Oliver, the eminent soldier and general, the great Protector ruling England with unlimited

power, was neither a fanatic nor a patriot, but a usurper blinded by former successes, relying on his personal power, a political gamester who played a desperate game with uncommon success and gave it up only in death as lost. As statesman he was bold and shrewd, but without originality, a slavish imitator of Henry VIII. and Elisabeth. With toleration on his lips he became one of the worst persecutors not only of Catholics and Anglicans, but of the very sectaries that had lifted him to absolute power. His system of taxation was more arbitrary and oppressive, and more heartily detested than that of Charles I. In his long career he rejected at every stage the principles he had boldly avowed at the previous stage, and covered every change, from constitutional opponent to revolutionist, to regicide, to conqueror, to tyrant, with the cloak of the most repulsive religious cant.

544. Anarchy. — Cromwell was succeeded by his eldest son Richard, a tool of the army, who after an administration of eight months retired to private life, 1659. The state of anarchy which followed his resignation was terminated by general George Monk, the English commander-in-chief stationed in Scotland. He was joined by general Fairfax. Monk returned with his army to London and assumed control of affairs as captain-general, until a Parliament of both Houses summoned by him proclaimed Charles II. king of England, 1660.

Lingard: vol. 10, chs. 5 and 6; vol. 11, chs. 1–3. — Gardiner: *The Commonwealth and Protectorate;* vol. 1, 1649–51; vol. 2, 1651–54; vol. 3, 1654–56; *Student's Hist.;* ch. 36; *Epochs:* chs. 8–10, pp. 154–205. — Drane: ch. 35. — Green: chs. 11 and 12. — Godwin: *Hist. of the Commonwealth.* — Guizot: *Cromwell and the Protectorate; Richard Cromwell and the Restoration.* — W. S. Douglas: *Cromwell's Scotch Campaign, 1650–51.* — Gardiner: *Cromwell and Mazarin*: E. H. R., v. 11, p. 479. — Oppenheim: *The Navy of the Commonwealth, 1649–1660*: E. H. R., v. 13, p. 20. — Carlyle: *Letters and Speeches of Oliver Cromwell.* — E. Jenks: *The Constitutional Experiments of the Commonwealth.* — D. W. Rannie: *Cromwell's Major-Generals:* E. H. R., v. 10, p. 471. — *Letters Concerning the Dissolution of Cromwell's Last Parliament:* E. H. R., v. 7, p. 102. — *Cromwell and the Insurrection of 1655:* E. H. R., vol. 3, pp. 323, 521, 722; vol. 4, pp. 110, 313, 525 (Controversy between C. H. Firth and F. D. Palgrave). — *Lives of O. Cromwell* by: Ch. Adams; Carlyle; Guizot; Fr. Harrison; Headly; J. Morley; Palgrave; Theod. Roosevelt; W. Russel. — Zimmermann: *Zur Charakteristik Cromwell's:* H. J- B., v. 11, pp. 23, 217. — J. Forster: *Statesmen of the Commonwealth.* — S. R. Gardiner: *Cromwell's Place in History.*

CHAPTER V.

THE AGE OF LOUIS XIV.

§ 1.

THE RESTORATION OF THE STUARTS.

545. Declaration of Breda. — General Monk crossed the border January, 1660, and was joined by general Fairfax. Entering London he coerced the Rump, which had been restored by the army, to readmit the members formerly expelled by Pride's Purge. The Long Parliament, thus reconstructed, voted its own dissolution to be followed by a free election. The new Parliament was called Convention Parliament, because the Commons were convened without royal summons. While in session, it received from Charles II. a royal manifesto, "The Declaration of Breda," in which he offered pardon to all, except some regicides to be designated by Parliament, promised liberty to "tender consciences," and pledged his royal assent to any acts of Parliament, which would satisfy the claims of the army, and settle the ownership of confiscated estates. The Convention Parliament welcomed the Declaration and passed the resolution, which put an end to the Puritan Revolution: that "according to the ancient and fundamental law of this Kingdom, the government is, and ought to be, by King, Lords and Commons."

546. **Political Articles of the Restoration.** — Charles II. landed in May and was received with an outburst of loyalty. He formed his Privy Council of four royalists and four Presbyterians. His brother, James, duke of York, was appointed lord high admiral. General Monk, created duke of Albermarle, became captain-general. Sir Edward Hyde, subsequently earl of Clarendon, as lord chancellor, practically stood at the head of the government for the next seven years. In accordance with the Declaration of Breda, the Convention Parliament passed an Act of Indemnity, from which, however, regicides and prominent leaders of the Commonwealth were excluded.

Fourteen regicides were executed, others imprisoned or banished. The army was paid, and with the exception of about 5,000 men, disbanded. The crown and the church lands, and private estates, of which the owners had been forcibly dispossessed, reverted to their natural owners under the ordinary laws, whilst the Bill of Sales confirmed the sales of royalist property made with the consent of the owners. All Acts of the Long Parliament, to which Charles I. had assented, were declared in force. The Convention Parliament gave to Charles II. an annual revenue of 1,200,000*l.* in exchange for some feudal rights. As the Presbyterian majority and the Anglican minority could not agree on a bill of church government, the Convention Parliament was dissolved in December, 1660.

547. The Cavalier Parliament, 1661–79 — Political Acts. — The new Parliament, which met in 1661 and lasted nineteen years, had in a House of over 500 members, a royalist majority of 450. The Commons ordered the Solemn League and Covenant to be burnt by the hangman, handed back to the king the veto power and the entire control of the sea and land forces, made it a penal offense to wage war against the crown and to maintain that any legislative power could be exercised without the king. In 1664 Parliament repealed the Triennial Act of the Long Parliament, which had ordered the assembling of Parliament every three years, even though not summoned by the king. But this Parliament zealously retained the full power of granting or denying subsidies.

548. The Religious Question. — Charles II. was personally an enemy of persecution. His desire was to bring about toleration for all dissenters in order to alleviate the lot of the persecuted Catholics. He had reasons to be grateful to them. Of the 500 cavaliers who had fought for his father, nearly 200 were Catholics. Catholics had suffered most for their faithful adherence to his father. Catholic princes had befriended him in his exile. He had made promises to his Catholic subjects, which he earnestly wished to fulfill. But the more this feeling was suspected or known to his Protestant subjects, the more it kindled the old, blind and fanatical hatred of "Popery" in both Anglicans and Dissenters. The second Parliament of Charles II. made itself the uncompromising organ of religious persecution. In 1661 the Commons sent in a bill for the restoration of Episcopacy to the Lords. The Catholic members, led by Lord Bristol, asked for delay. They wanted to pass a measure of toleration

before the bishops were restored. But Clarendon's influence, who was a strong Anglican, prevailed with the king, and Episcopacy was restored before any relief was given to the Nonconformists. After this restoration, Charles II. never succeeded in obtaining legal toleration for the Catholics.

549. Anti-Catholic Legislation and Royal Attempts to Evade It. — The power of Presbyterianism was destroyed by the Act of Corporation which made membership in any municipality dependent on the renunciation of the League and Covenant, on the oath of non-resistance to the king, and on receiving communion according to the Anglican rite (1661). The *Uniformity Act* obliged all clergymen and teachers to use the Anglican prayer book under penalty of losing their positions. Two thousand clergymen are said to have given up their holdings rather than submit to the Book of Common Prayer (1662). The attempts of the king to evade these acts by the "power of indulgence or the right of dispensation," were frustrated by the opposition of Clarendon, the angry remonstrances of the Commons and their threats of refusing supplies. The *Conventicle Act* of 1664 absolutely forbade religious meetings of more than four Nonconformists (Catholics or Dissenters) in addition to the household, and was enforced by an ascending scale of penalties for repeated acts terminating in seven years' transportation with its slave labor under the burning sun of the West Indies (1664). *The Five Mile Act* imposed six months' imprisonment or a fine of 40*l.* on priests and ministers who came within five miles of any city, town or borough without having previously taken the usual test oaths, 1665. It entailed extreme hardships on the Catholics, and together with the Conventicle Act revived the infamous trade of the spies and informers who received one-third of the fines. Charles always yielded when he met with determined resistance, or when he was in need of money; and he was well paid for his compliance. Thus he obtained a subsidy of 1,200,000*l.* for signing the Five Mile Act, and an annual grant of 300,000*l.* for five years for signing a second and still harsher Conventicle Act in 1670. These measures of persecution secured the triumph of the Anglican Establishment as it has existed to the present day.

550. The Cabal. — After Clarendon's fall (no. 563) a select committee of the Privy Council, entirely dependent on the king, was intrusted with the management of affairs. From the initials of the five counsellors this cabinet was called the "Cabal."

Clifford was a brave and honest Catholic. Arlington sympathized with the Catholics. Buckingham, and Lord Ashley Cooper, violently anti-Catholic as he was, favored the toleration of Protestant sects. The duke of Lauderdale, viceroy of Scotland, was a dissolute man of the world, the purveyor to the king's most shameless vices. Three measures are accredited to

the Cabal: the War with Holland (no. 559), the Stop of the Exchequer, and the Declaration of Indulgence. In spite of Parliamentary grants and of lavish subsidies which Charles II. received from the king of France, he was burdened with a debt of 3,000,000*l.* owing to the enormous sums which he squandered in criminal pleasures. To disentangle himself from this indebtedness, the king refused, in 1672, to repay 1,400,000*l.* lent him by the goldsmiths, the bankers of those days, and reduced the interest of the money thus confiscated, from 12 to 6%. This measure, called the Stop of the Exchequer, caused great financial distress.

The Declaration of Indulgence was issued in virtue of the king's "supreme power in ecclesiastical affairs." It suspended the penal laws against any class of Nonconformists, and in imitation of the Edict of Nantes, allowed Protestants to hold public services in certain places, Catholics only in their private houses. Ashley, who drew up the Declaration, was rewarded with the earldom of Shaftesbury, 1673.

551. The Test Act. — The Declaration of Indulgence was of short duration. The Parliamentary session of 1673 turned its whole energy to the persecution of Catholics. By suspending supplies, they forced the king to withdraw the Declaration of Indulgence, to revive penal laws, to banish all Jesuits and secular priests, save those in attendance upon the Catholic queen and the foreign ambassadors, and, moreover, to sign a Test Act, by which no one could hold office unless he explicitly denied the doctrine of Transubtantiation. The "monstrum horrendum ingens," as the Act was characterized by Clifford, received a large majority in both houses. In view of his signature the king was paid a subsidy of 1,260,000*l.* "for this extraordinary occasion." Whilst it was easy for dissenters to evade the Test Act, every honest Catholic was at once driven from office. James, duke of York, already a Catholic, resigned his post as lord high admiral, to the great loss of the nation. Clifford laid down the treasurer's staff. Prince Rupert got the admiralship, Lord Danby the treasury. The Cabal broke up. Charles II. gave up all further attempts to obtain toleration for the Catholics.

552. James, Duke of York. — James, duke of York, had been a zealous Anglican. His first religious doubts rose from the reading of a controversial work written by an Anglican bishop. Further studies convinced him of

the truth of the Catholic faith, and settled his intention of returning to the Church. The king approved of his resolution. James was thoroughly sincere, and after his conversion resisted numerous attempts made by the king, the Anglican bishops and leading members of Parliament to alter his mind. The religious feelings of Charles II. were superficial and temporary, asserting themselves only in the comparatively few serious moments of his dissipated life, feelings in which the hope of rich subsidies from Louis XIV. and of his consequent independence from Parliament formed the strongest ingredients. James made his profession of faith in 1672; Charles II. on his death-bed.

553. Causes of the Persecution of Catholics. — The violence of public feeling against the Catholics, apart from the bigotry of the period and the selfish intrigues of rival ministers, was fostered by the fear of a Catholic succession and by the foreign policy of Charles II. James, duke of York, in the absence of legitimate heirs to the king, was the presumptive successor of Charles II. He had been first married to Anne Hyde, Clarendon's daughter. His two daughters from this marriage, Mary and Anne, had been brought up as Protestants. He married again in 1673, this time a Catholic, Mary of Este, princess of Modena. A boy born to the duke and educated as a Catholic would become the future king of England. Shaftesbury, who had fallen from office with the Cabal, now rallied the Protestants in a scheme of toleration for all but Catholics. He organized a violent opposition to the court, and made the "Catholic Succession" his war cry. The chief characteristic of the king's foreign policy was his subserviency to the designs of Louis XIV., and his dependence on the French king from whom he received large pensions and subsidies, which his own subjects often withheld from him. Louis' aggressions on the Continent gradually roused the indignation of the English people. They identified, though without reason, the Catholic Church and French interests. Englishmen in general suspected, and a few knew, that Charles had made arrangements with Louis for a change of religion in England. The English people thought that he cherished the project, to make himself independent of Parliament with the aid of the French king, and to set up a regime, like that of Louis, of arbitrary power and personal rule. Hence Popery, arbitrary power and foreign dependence on the one hand, and Protestantism, constitutional liberty and national independence on the other, became synonyms with a generation that

had lost all knowledge and sober judgment of what Catholicism really was.

Books for Consultation: (Covering the whole Period): Lingard: vol. 11, chs. 4-6; vol. 12 (*Charles II.*), vol. 13 (*James II.; the Revolution*). — Gardiner: *Student's Hist. of Engl.*, vol. 2, pp. 578-648; vol. 3, pp. 649-701. — Green: *Hist. of the Engl. People;* Book 8. chs. 1-3. — Drane: pp. 525-621. — Guizot: *History of England*, vol. 3, chs. 29-31; vol. 4, chs. 32-33. — (Special Works): *On Charles II.:* Baillon: (*Correspondence: from Henriette to Anne*); Abbot; Barker; Clayton, (*Personal Memoirs*); MacCormack; Malloy, (*Royalty Restored; London under Charles II.*); Sidney, (*Diary*). — *On Clarendon:* Campbell: (*Lives of Lord Chancellors*); Lawrence, (*British Historians*); Lister, (*Life and Administration*); Macdiarmid (*Brit. Statesmen*). — W. D. Christie: *Life of Ashley, First Earl of Shaftesbury. — Lauderdale and the Restoration in Scotland*: Q. R., '84, 2. — Bridgett: *The Religious Test Acts;* M. '95, 2, pp. 58, 190. — Onno Klopp: *Fall des Hauses Stuart*, vol. 1, pp. 1-32. — Dodd: *The Church Hist. of Engl., 1500-1688.*

§ 2.

STATE OF EUROPE AT THE RESTORATION OF THE STUARTS.

554. Emperor Leopold I., 1658-1705. — Leopold I. was elected Emperor in 1658. Leopold I. was a prince of high culture and great piety, mild and generous, a model in his private and family life, and almost scrupulous in his anxiety to do right. His unswerving truthfulness, and the inviolability of his promises were recognized at every court of Europe; even the Turks made it a rule to demand his own signature to the terms of capitulation, when they surrendered their fortresses to his victorious generals. But he had his share of Hapsburg slowness, indecision, dependence upon advisers and lavishness in rewarding real or imaginary services, while he lacked the energy to punish the enormous peculations of officials. Accordingly, he was always poor. Poverty was the chief cause, that prevented him from driving the Turks out of Europe. Still no Hapsburg reign ever had to record greater wars and more glorious victories than the reign of this monarch, who was by nature eminently peace-loving. He was elected in spite of the bribes shamefully proffered by the French agents, and as shamefully accepted by the German electors, because historical tradition, the resources of his hereditary states, and their geographical position, made him the natural defender of western Christendom against the power of Islam. Cardinal Mazarin succeeded, however, in saddling Leopold's election with a condition which prevented the Emperor from aiding Spain against France, viz.: that the territory bordering on the Spanish Netherlands should be closed to Leopold's army. A Confederacy of Rhenish princes with France and Sweden guaranteed this condition.

555. Personal Government of Louis XIV., 1661-1715. — With the death of Mazarin, 1661, began the period of Louis XIV.'s absolutism, during which

he united in his person and performed with increasing energy the functions both of royalty and of the prime ministership. Whether he did or did not use the expression ascribed to him: L'état c'est moi, "I am the state," it certainly expresses the nature of his rule. His ministers in the course of time became his mere men of affairs who had to receive their instructions from him. His aims were by the use of unlimited power at home to strengthen and extend his northern frontiers, to seek what he considered the natural limits of France, and with a complete disregard of political morality to obtain possession of the imperial crown, to annex the Spanish monarchy to France, and thus to become the arbiter of Europe. It was the good fortune of Louis XIV. to be surrounded throughout his reign by men eminent in every department of Church and State, to whose genius far more than to any performance of his own he owes the title "le Grand" bestowed upon him by his countrymen. Colbert's capacity for finance not only paid off the debts left by Mazarin, but secured a revenue of 31,000,000 livres to the king. The indomitable energy and organizing talent of the marquis of Louvois placed in the very first war of Louis a well-drilled army of 150,000 men in the field. The military genius of Turenne and Condé, and the engineering skill of Vauban fought the king's battles and conducted the king's sieges. The navy restored by Lionne numbered in 1667, 100 men-of-war carrying 3,700 guns. These and other men of the same stamp gave brilliancy to the reign of "the grand monarch."

556. Sweden after the Thirty Years' War. — The death of Gustavus Adolphus was followed by the coronation of his daughter, Christina, as queen of Sweden (1632–54). She was a lady remarkable for her manly character, penetrating intellect, varied learning and extravagant ways. Throwing herself into the study of religion, she became convinced of the truth of Catholicity. She voluntarily abdicated in favor of her cousin, Charles X. Gustavus, of the Palatine side line of Zweibrücken, the son of a sister of Gustavus Adolphus. Christina then left Sweden, swore off the Lutheran creed at Brussels, made profession of the Catholic faith in Innsbruck, and chose Rome for her residence, where she died in 1689.

The year of Charles II.'s accession was signalized in the north by the Treaties of Oliva and Copenhagen. They respectively terminated the wars which Christina's successor, the aggressive Charles X., had waged with Poland and Denmark. One of the chief gainers in the Swedish-Polish war was Frederic William, elector of Brandenburg, who held Prussia as a fief of Poland. By assisting Sweden against Poland, he obtained from Charles X. full sovereignty over Prussia; and by subsequently assisting Poland against Sweden, he obtained the confirmation of his sovereignty from John Casimir of Poland. In the Peace of Oliva, John Casimir abandoned his hereditary claims to the Swedish crown, and left the provinces of Esthonia and Livonia in the hands of Sweden. In the Peace of Copenhagen Sweden and Denmark settled their territorial disputes.

557. **Relations Between France and England, Spain and Portugal.** — As it was an essential part of the anti-Hapsburg policy of Louis XIV. to keep in close touch with Sweden and the Rhenish provinces in the north, so he sought to engage the assistance of England and Portugal against Spain in the south. After the Peace of the Pyrenees Philip IV. of Spain had no greater desire than to reconquer Portugal from the House of Braganza, the more so as Louis had promised in the same Peace to withdraw all aid from Portugal in her war of independence against Spain. To effect indirectly what he could not publicly avow, the weakening of Spain by Portugal, he offered to Charles II. his services to negotiate a marriage between the English king and Catharine of Braganza, the princess of Portugal. Whilst this matrimonial contract brought to Charles the possession of Tangier in Africa, and Bombay, the first territory of the English crown in East India, free trade in Brazil, and a dowry of 500,000*l.* it obliged Charles to send eight frigates and 4,000 men to Portugal. To strengthen his friendship with Louis XIV. Charles, without opposition on the part of the Parliament and the privy council, and but a passing opposition on the part of Clarendon, sold Dunkirk to France for 200,000*l.* Though this Cromwellian acquisition had been far more a source of expenditure than an advantage to England, the sale roused a howl of indignation against Clarendon.

558. The Dutch Republic.

William the Silent, Prince of Orange.

Maurice, Stadtholder, 1587–1625.	Frederic Henry, Stadtholder, 1625–47.
	William II., Stadtholder, 1647–50.

The last stadtholder general in the United Provinces had been William II., by his marriage with princess Mary of England the brother-in-law of Charles II. After his death in 1650, the merchant aristocracy of Holland succeeded in grasping the reins of government. They prevented the election of a captain-general, and elected no stadtholder. The one army of the Republic was broken up into seven provincial armies, and each portion had to obey the civil authority of the respective province. As each town, self-governing in local affairs, sent its deputies to the Provincial States, so each province sent its deputies to the States-General, meeting at the Hague. In Holland — alone richer and more powerful than all her sister provinces together — the Provincial Estates, "Their High Mightinesses," were the ruling power. The Hague was also the residence of a Council of State, consisting of twelve members sent by the different provinces. The secretary of this Council was called the grand pensionary, and stood virtually at the head of the general administration. The Peace of London, by terminating the war of the Navigation Act, strengthened the merchant party. This party promised

to Cromwell the exclusion of the House of Orange from the general stadtholdership and the admiralty.

Onno Klopp: *Der Fall des Hauses Stuart und die Succession des Hauses Hanover*, vol. 1, Book 1, pp. 33–111. — O. Airy: *The English Restoration and Louis XIV.*, chs. 7–11, pp. 88–132. — *Leopold I.*, St., v. 9, p. 472; H. P. B., v. 101, p. 36; vol. 102, p. 553. — Doellinger: *The Policy of Louis XIV.: Studies.* — *Louvois and the French Army:* M. '81, 1, pp. 191, 333, 465. — Duc D'Aumale: *Hist. des Princes de Condé pendant les 16–17ième siècles.* — Perkins: *The Great Condé:* E. H. R., v. 3, p. 478. — W. O'Connor Morris: *Turenne:* E. H. R., v. 2, p. 260. — Villars: v. 8, p. 61. — *Vauban and Modern Sieges:* Q. R. '82, 4, p. 401. —G. Michel: *Hist. de Vauban.* — E. M. Lloyd: *Catinat.*

§ 3.

FOREIGN POLICY OF CHARLES II. THE FIRST ANGLO-DUTCH WAR, 1665–67.

559. Causes of the Anglo-Dutch War. — There were two parties in the United Provinces at the time of Charles' accession in England, the ruling party of the merchant aristocracy, represented by the province of Holland and John de Witt, since 1653 grand pensionary, and the opposition party represented by the House of Orange, the young prince (William III.), the nobles, the army, the Calvinistic clergy and the common people. The Dutch were still irritated by the Navigation Act and the treaty obligation of saluting the English flag in English waters. The sailors of both countries carried on a fierce naval contest in every part of the globe. The Dutch inflicted all possible damage on English trade and shipping in the West Indies and on the coast of Africa. The English retaliated in kind. Having taken possession of Bombay, they injured the eastern trade of Holland. They organized filibustering expeditions along the African coast. In 1664 they conquered New Amsterdam in North America, which the Dutch West India Company had held for forty years, and which Charles II., in honor of his brother James, duke of York, now called New York. This was actual war without a declaration of war. Charles had a personal grudge against Holland, for having treated him with scanty courtesy during his exile. In view of Charles' animosity, De Witt as early as 1662 concluded a secret treaty with Louis XIV., in which the two Powers guaranteed each other's European possessions, and arranged for mutual defense.

560. The First Anglo-Dutch War of the Restoration — Campaign of 1665. — War was declared in 1665 with the full consent of Parliament. The English fleet, commanded by the duke of York, won a complete victory over the Dutch off Lowestoft (June 3). In October the English land-forces overran the province of Overyssel, while Bernard of Galen, bishop of Münster, a churchman equally eminent as pastor, reformer and ruler, entered the ill-defended territory of the eastern provinces. Meanwhile a new fleet had been fitted out by John de Witt, which in spite of the stormy season challenged the English navy. But owing to the ravages of the plague in England the challenge remained unanswered.

561. **Campaign of 1666.** — The following year Louis XIV., called upon by John de Witt to carry out the secret treaty of 1662, declared war against England, sent a force against the bishop of Münster, and *promised* to dispatch a fleet to the North Sea. The Republic allied itself with Denmark, Brandenburg and Brunswick. Thus Bernard of Galen had to renounce his alliance with Charles II., and England now stood alone.

On June 1, the English and Dutch fleets met off the Dunes and for four days fought the most terrible sea battle in history. The Dutch under De Ruyter and Tromp kept their fleets united, the English under prince Rupert and Albemarle (Monk) divided their forces, Rupert in vain seeking the French fleet which Louis had *not* sent out, preferring to see the two naval powers exhaust their own strength. The smaller English fleet suffered enormous losses (8,000 killed or captured), whilst the Dutch fleet was at last so hopelessly scattered as to be unable to pursue the retreating English. On August 4 the Dutch were decisively defeated off the coast of Norfolk by the finest fleet which England had yet put to sea, and sought safety in the shallows of Zeeland, whilst an English frigate, accompanied by five fire ships, entered the harbor of Flie, and destroyed 151 Dutch merchant ships valued at 1,000,000*l*.

In September the fleets met a third time in the Channel, but a storm separated them. The same storm fanned a London fire into a three days' conflagration, destroying 32,000 houses and 89 churches. The rebuilding of the city with wider streets and better air removed the principal cause of the frequently occurring plague.

562. **The Peace of Breda, 1667.** — Both countries needed peace. In the Republic, which was more exhausted than England, a strong party clamored

for the restoration of the stadtholdership, and forced De Witt to adopt the young prince of Orange as the child of the state. De Witt himself instructed him in the art of government. England, too, was exhausted, the treasury empty, Parliament petitioning for peace. The conference met at Breda. Before they arrived at an understanding, Charles II. and Louis XIV. concluded a secret treaty in which Louis pledged himself to withhold the promised fleet from aiding the Republic, and Charles allowed the king of France, for a year, freedom of action in the Spanish Netherlands.

To accelerate the peace negotiations, De Ruyter, knowing that England had made no preparations for hostilities, on June 7, 1667, entered the Thames, scattered the fortifications of Sheerness, sailed up the Medway, burnt three English men-of-war at the wharf of Chatham, and captured the "Royal Charles." He gained his point. On July 31, the Peace of Breda was signed. Each nation retained the conquests made up to May 1667. The Act of Navigation was so far modified that Dutch vessels were allowed to carry Dutch, Flemish and German goods into English ports. The saluting of English men-of-war was made a matter of courtesy.

563. Clarendon's Fall. — The disaster at Chatham led to the fall of Clarendon. Beneath the open charges, such as the sale of Dunkirk and others, mostly untrue, which brought about Clarendon's fall, was the belief that the minister conducted his foreign policy in the interest of Louis XIV. Urged by the king and the duke of York, Clarendon fled to France, and Parliament passed the sentence of his banishment for life.

564. Breda and the Perpetual Edict. — De Witt used the Peace of Breda to strengthen his party at home. By the Perpetual Edict military power by land and sea was to be forever separated from the general stadtholdership, and the special stadtholdership of the province of Holland was abolished.

Books under § 1. — Onno Klopp: Fall (on *Anglo-Dutch War to the Triple Alliance*, 1665-1668), Book 2, p. 113-226. — *Arlington Letters.* — Courtenay: *Memoirs of Sir Wm. Temple.* — Burnet: *History of My Own Time*, ed. by O. Airy, Part 1. — *The Reign of Charles II.* — J. R. Tanner: *The Administration of the Navy from the Restoration to the Revolution:* E. H. R., v. 12, p. 17. — Airy: *The English Restoration and Louis XIV* (*Epochs.*): *The Dutch War*, pp. 132-146.

§ 4.

LOUIS XIV. — THE FIRST WAR OF SPOLIATION AND THE TREATY OF DOVER.

565. Death of Philip IV. of Spain. — Philip IV. died in 1665 without having realized the desire of his life, the reconquest of Portugal from the House

of Braganza. The decisive battle at Villa Viciosa, where the Spanish army was utterly defeated, broke his heart. In vain Louis XIV. had displayed his diplomatic arts to make him acknowledge the claims of France to the Spanish succession, in case the male line of the Spanish House of Hapsburg should die out. In his will Philip IV. settled the succession on his son Charles II., whom his second wife, Mary Anne, daughter of Emperor Ferdinand III., had borne to him, and completely ignored the French pretensions to a future succession.

566. The Right of Devolution. — To obtain a part at least of the coveted possessions, Louis XIV. undertook his first war of spoliation against the Spanish Netherlands. A local custom in Brabant, which regulated the inheritance of children from different marriages, called the right of devolution, gave preference to the daughter of a first marriage over the sons of a second marriage. This custom referred solely to *private* property, and prevailed only in some of the Low Countries. Louis XIV. audaciously twisted this private and local custom into a claim to the whole of the Spanish Netherlands, because he had married Maria Theresa, Philip IV.'s daughter from his first marriage. The Spanish law of succession recognized no right of devolution.

567. The War of Devolution in 1667. — Louis opened the war in May, 1667, well prepared for the undertaking. He was sure of Holland by his nominal alliance with the Dutch; of England, by his secret treaty with Charles II.; of Portugal, by a compact which bound that country to continue the war with Spain; of the electors of Mainz and Koeln and other German princes by the Rhenish Confederacy (no. 554). Without any declaration of war Louis and Turenne at the head of 50,000 men crossed the frontier into the Netherlands which commanded only 20,000 men scattered over a great number of forts, and were unprepared for an attack. Simultaneously he sent a statement to the Spanish and other courts, that he was taking possession of his wife's inheritance; he was not waging war, but only traveling in the Netherlands. And in fact, the whole campaign was a holiday affair. In less than two months all the fortresses of the southern Netherlands were in the hands of Louis XIV. After a truce of three months mediated by the Pope Louis sent Condé with 15,000 chosen troops into Franche Comté (the Free

County of Burgundy), and in two weeks all its fortified places were in his hands.

568. The Triple Alliance. — Since the Peace of Westphalia it had been the settled conviction of Holland, that a barrier of Spanish territory between the Republic and France was necessary as a safeguard against the latter. Accordingly to stop a further advance of France, John de Witt and Sir William Temple succeeded in uniting Holland, England and Sweden in the so-called Triple Alliance. The obvious aim was to induce France and Spain to come to an understanding. But the real object of the treaty, expressed in a secret clause, was to force France to make peace; if she refused, the war against her should be continued with the aid of the three allied Powers, until France should be reduced to the condition established by the Peace of the Pyrenees. The open clauses of the alliance were placed before Louis XIV., whilst Condé was invading the Free County.

569. The Peace of Aachen (Aix-la-Chapelle), 1668. — Meanwhile Charles II. had made peace with Portugal, recognized her independence (1667), and was thereby enabled to concentrate his forces against France. Louis was aware of the secret clause of the alliance through the treachery of Charles II. Under these circumstances he declared himself willing with a show of moderation to restore part of his conquests, whilst England and Holland engaged to force the desired peace upon Spain. This Treaty of Aachen gave to Louis a belt of twelve fortresses in the southern Netherlands, and restored Franche Comté to Spain.

570. Treaty of Dover, 1670. — The Triple Alliance conceived by John De Witt had aroused in Louis XIV. feelings of bitter resentment against Holland. Nothing less than the destruction of the Republic would satisfy his anger. Hence his incessant endeavors to break up the Triple Alliance. His negotiations with Charles II. lasted till 1670, when Charles' favorite sister Henrietta, duchess of Orleans, met her royal brother at Dover. The result was a treaty in which religious interests were viciously mixed up with designs of revenge and ambition. The treaty, signed by Colbert and Arling-

ton, broke up the Triple Alliance and made Charles II. an ally of Louis XIV. According to its terms (a) Charles II. was to declare his return to the Catholic Church whenever he deemed it proper. Should his subjects resist his conversion, Louis was to give him 154,000*l.* and the aid of 6,000 men for his defense. (b) In the contemplated war against the Dutch Republic an English land force of 6,000 men under French command, and thirty French ships joining the larger English fleet under an English admiral were to co-operate. For this Charles II. was promised an annual subsidy of 225,000*l.* for the time of the war, and three towns on the coast of Zeeland at its conclusion. (c) In the case of a failure of the Spanish male line, Charles was to assist Louis in obtaining the Spanish succession; for this aid he should receive additional territories in Spain and South America.

The fatal flaw in the plan was that a change abhorred by the Parliament, the dominant clergy and the majority of the people was to be effected by the interference of a foreign king who was hated in England as a despot. Since this treaty could not be shown to any of Charles' Protestant advisers, the king commissioned Shaftesbury to negotiate a treaty with Louis identical with the real treaty of Dover except in two points: no mention was made of the king's conversion, and the sum promised for that purpose was thrown in with the French war subsidy. This sham treaty of Dover was destined for eventual public use.

A few months after the conclusion of the secret Treaty of Dover, Charles met his Parliament, palmed himself off as a zealous adherent of the Triple Alliance and obtained by his duplicity a new grant of 800,000*l.*

Authorities under § 2. — Flassan: *Histoire de la diplomatie française.* — Onno Klopp: *Fall (from the Treaty of Dover to the outbreak of the Second War of Spoliation, 1668–1672).* — *Oeuvres de Louis XIV.* (vol. 1 and 2). — Henry Vast: *Les Grands Traités du Règne de Louis XIV.* (*Aix-la-Chapelle*). — Geddes: *History of the Administration of John de Witt.* — Airy: *The English Restoration, etc.*, pp. 146–200.

§ 5.

THE SECOND WAR OF SPOLIATION, 1672–79, AND THE REUNIONS, 1680–84.

571. The Invasion of Holland, 1672. — Louis' policy of isolating Holland was a complete success. The king of England was his ally by the Treaty of Dover, and in 1672 Louis concluded a defensive and offensive treaty with Sweden, the last support of the Dutch Republic. Holland was entirely

unprepared for an attack by land; 41,000 men had been disbanded, and there was little discipline among the remaining 52,000. The best officers had resigned out of sympathy with William of Orange, who had escaped from De Witt's surveillance. Six provinces compelled the grand pensionary to relinquish the chief command to William. The diplomatic attempts of De Witt to pacify Louis XIV. and Charles II. were repelled with studied rudeness and repeated insults. The only defensive treaties, which De Witt had succeeded in forming, were with the electors of Brandenburg and Mainz, and with Spain, which saw the rest of the Spanish Netherlands endangered by the ruin of the Dutch Republic.

The French army, 176,000 strong, was officered by such eminent generals as Condé, Turenne, Luxembourg, and the great engineer Vauban, and was admirably equipped and provisioned. It was an easy task to overrun the country. Before the end of June, Louis had three provinces, Gelders, Utrecht and Overyssel, and many towns of Holland in his grip. When, however, Amsterdam was threatened, De Witt, by a heroic resolution, ordered the sluices of St. Anthony to be opened, and the ocean, rushing in between the enemy and the city of Amsterdam, cut off any further attack by land. Zeeland, too, succeeded in repelling a French invasion. Admiral Ruyter, in a bitterly contested sea-fight in Southwold Bay, saved the coasts of the Republic from an attack by the united fleets of France and England.

572. Reaction in Holland. — Meanwhile a powerful reaction against the merchant party and its representative, John de Witt, had set in. The most atrocious calumnies were leveled against the grand pensionary, especially from the pulpits of the Calvinistic clergy. The States of Holland, after burning the Perpetual Edict, named the prince, now William III., stadtholder and captain general of all the land and naval forces, offices which subsequently were again made hereditary in his family. John de Witt and his brother Cornelius were murdered with barbarous atrocity by the adherents of William. The full blame of this foul deed must be thrown on William, for he not only connived at it and encouraged the perpetrators, but rewarded the murderers by public preferment. The States General, then, rejected the exorbitant demands of Louis XIV. and Charles II., and the negotiations begun by John de Witt came to an end.

573. The Campaign in Germany, and the First Great Coalition, 1672–73. — The resolution of Leopold I. in June, 1672, to enter the contest with Louis by an alliance with the weaker side for the defense of public right, was the starting point of the great European coalitions. The union of the Imperial and the Brandenburg forces shifted the seat of war to the Rhine. In the winter campaign of 1672–73, Turenne, reinforced by the troops of Münster and Koeln, pushed the army of the Austrian General Montecuculi and the elector of Brandenburg across the Rhine and the Weser, and maintained an unassailable position in Westphalia, whilst William of Orange suffered a decided check at Charleroi. On the other hand the descent of the English and French fleets under prince Rupert and D'Éstrées upon the coast of Zeeland was prevented by Ruyter and Tromp in three murderous battles. Under these circumstances neither Louis nor Holland was willing to make peace.

In August, 1673, treaties were signed between the Emperor, Spain, the Dutch Republic and the duke of Lorraine, subsequently joined by Denmark and Brandenburg. Their object was to restore the state of affairs as established by the treaties of Westphalia, the Pyrenees and Aachen, and to reinstate the exiled duke of Lorraine in his possessions.

574. Campaign of 1673 and the Peace of Westminster. — The fall of Maestricht roused the Emperor and Spain to the uttermost efforts. Montecuculi marched against Turenne, and crossed the Rhine into the Palatinate. William III. took Naarden. The French retreated on the whole line. William then hastened to the Rhine to join Montecuculi. Both took Bonn. Münster and Koeln at once made peace. The Dutch Republic and the right bank of the Rhine were freed from the enemy. Charles II. had to yield to the clamor of Parliament, and to conclude with the Dutch the Peace of Westminster, 1674. The Republic agreed to salute the English flag from Land's End northward, to pay 800,000 crowns, and yield the conquests made by England outside of Europe. Charles II. to show his personal friendship to Louis left 6,000 men under Turenne in French service. After the Peace of Westminster the allies accepted Charles II. as mediator. Nymwegen was chosen for the meeting of the Peace Congress.

575. Campaign of 1674. — The war, begun against Holland, now turned into a war against the territories of the Spanish crown. The year 1674 witnessed Turenne's most brilliant exploits, and displayed the superiority which a single power like France, ably generaled, may have over a coalition however extensive. Louis invaded and occupied the Free County. Condé routed William's rear guard at Seneff, but was not able to dislodge the prince from his position. Turenne, after maneuvering with a small force on the Upper Rhine, and inflicting the first great devastation on the Palatinate, concentrated by a splendid feat of strategy 40,000 men at Belfort, surprised and routed Montecuculi at Mühlhausen, defeated the elector of Brandenburg at Colmar, and cleared the left bank of the Rhine of the allied troops.

576. Campaigns of 1675–79. — The campaign on the Rhine of 1675 was one of crossing and recrossing the river. At Sassbach in Baden, Turenne fell shot through the breast. The campaign on the Saar was disastrous to France. Créqui was utterly defeated by Charles V. duke of Lorraine, before Trier, and Trier itself captured. The Swedes too at the urgent request of Louis had at length entered Brandenburg, but their land forces were defeated by the elector at Fehrbellin, and their naval forces by the Dutch and Danish fleets. In this campaign the Swedes lost nearly all they had won in the Thirty Years' War.

Having secured the chief fortresses of Alsace, Condé, who had grown weary of action, returned to private life at the end of the campaign.

In 1576, the year when peace negotiations were opened at Nymwegen, the chief fighting was done in the Mediterranean where admiral Duquesne ruled the sea. He fought two drawn battles with Ruyter in the second of which the great sea king of the Republic fell without leaving any one to take his place. After Ruyter's fall Duquesne had an easy task in defeating the Dutch and Spanish fleets.

In 1677 Louis himself opened the campaign in the unusually early month of February. Valenciennes, the strongest fortress on the Scheldt, fell in a few days; after this Cambray and St. Omer. William was twice defeated. On the Rhine Créqui drove one German army across the river, forced another to capitulate and captured the important stronghold of Freiburg. The desire for peace now became general among the allies.

577. The Dutch Republic and the Peace of Nymwegen. — The conclusion of peace was delayed by the differences existing be-

tween Charles II. and his Parliament and between William III. and the merchant party of Holland. Charles played into the hands of Louis, whilst the Parliament clamored for war against him. The Merchant party demanded a separate peace with Louis, whilst William III. stuck to the allies.

To bring the tedious negotiations at Nymwegen to an issue, Louis XIV. in the spring of 1678 sent Créqui across the Rhine to keep the German forces in check, and by a ruse of war, surprised the Spanish fortresses of Ghent and Ypres. He gained his object. The States General clamored for peace. Secure of England and Holland, Louis sent his ultimatum to Nymwegen. He proposed the terms to each of the nations at war with him, terms not to be changed but to be accepted by May 10th, after which date he would no longer consider himself bound. Thereupon the States General dominated by the Merchant party betrayed the allies and concluded a separate peace with Louis XIV., August 11. Holland received back its whole territory in Europe; freedom of trade and navigation was restored between France and the Republic; the Dutch had to observe strict neutrality during the remainder of the war. William III. was reinstated in the principality of Orange and the rest of his estates.

578. Spain and the Other Allies. — Spain signed the peace September 17. Louis retained the Free County and a number of towns in Flanders, and restored the rest of the conquests, including four towns won in the Peace of Aachen.

The settlement left the territory of the Republic about equal to the present kingdom of Holland, and the Spanish Netherlands equal to the kingdom of Belgium.

The Emperor and France concluded peace February 5, 1679. Leopold was left the alternative of surrendering his own hereditary city of Freiburg or the fortress of Philipsburg. Considering Philipsburg of greater importance for the defense of the Empire, he sacrificed his own domain. For the rest of the allies the status of the Peace of Westphalia was re-established. The elector of Brandenburg had to relinquish nearly all his conquests to Sweden in the Peace of Germain-on-Laye, 1679.

579. **The Chambers of Reunion, 1680–84.** — Louis XIV. was now at the summit of his power. His boundless ambition urged onward by Louvois-

the minister of war, led him to annex fresh territories to France by an entirely new method, the so-called Chambers of Reunion. He constituted the Parliaments of Metz, Breisach, Besançon and Tournay as Royal Chambers of Reunion, or courts of claims with power to investigate and decide, what dependencies had at any time belonged to the territories ceded to France in the treaties of Westphalia, the Pyrenees and Nymwegen. When the courts had given their opinions, the king marched his troops into these territories, thus adding to violence in time of peace the mockery of legal proceedings in which one and the same person was accuser, witness, judge and executor. The object of these "Reunions" was to get the four Rhenish Electors into his power, and by their aid to obtain the imperial crown. The scheme succeeded for a time, because the allies had disbanded their armies and were distracted by dissensions; the Emperor was fully occupied with a Hungarian rebellion and a Turkish invasion; and the elector of Brandenburg sold his elective vote to the king of France for an annual subsidy of 100,000 livres. When the elector obliged himself by a new treaty to give effective aid to Louis without questioning, whether the cause was right or wrong, Louis raised his subsidy to 100,000 thalers. Charles II. of England was bought off from interfering by the payment of 2,000,000 livres, and Holland's action was paralyzed by the support which Louis gave to the merchant party against William III.

580. The "Reunions" and the Truce of Regensburg. — In pursuance of the Chamber decrees Louis took the duchy of Zweibrücken, the hereditary domain of the Swedish king, from Sweden, Strasburg from the Empire, Luxemburg from Spain, and other territories from weaker princes. The municipality of Strasburg, bribed by French gold, and influenced by the Archbishop, Cardinal Fürstenberg, a creature of Louis, handed over the city, the key of the Upper Rhine, without a show of resistance, 1681. In 1682 Louis occupied the principality of William of Orange. The following year, while the Turks were encamped before Vienna, he invaded the Spanish Netherlands, and took in 1684 Luxemburg and Trier, dismantling the forts of the latter city. At the same time he constantly urged the diet of Regensburg to acknowledge the legality of his annexations. When, however, his correspondence with Tököly, the arch-rebel of Hungary, was laid before all the courts of Europe, and Leopold steadfastly refused to cede the "reunited" territories, Louis contented himself with a truce that left open the question of right. By the Truce of Regensburg between Louis and the Emperor, Spain and the Empire, — Strasburg, Luxemburg and the territories

"reunited" up to August 1, 1681, i. e., the left bank of the Upper Rhine, or one eighth of the Empire, remained in his hands for twenty years; the rest he restored.

Authorities under §§ 1 and 2. — Wagner, S. J.: *Historia Leopoldi.* — A. Hassall: *Louis XIV. on the Zenith of the French Monarchy.* — Onno Klopp: *Fall (From the Beginning of the War to the Peace of Westminster)*, vol. 2, Book 4, pp. 300–380; Book 5, *From Peace of Westminster to the Peace of Nymwegen*, pp. 1–162; On *Reunions*, vol. 2, Book 5 and 6. — Airy: *Engl. Restoration*, etc., pp. 201–277. — J. R. Tanner: *The Administration of the Navy from the Restoration to the Revolution* (1673–1679), E. H. R., v. 12, p. 679; v. 13, p. 26. — Geddes: *John de Witt.* — A. L. Portalis: *Jean de Witt, Grand Pensionaire de Holland.* — On *John de Witt:* E. R. '84, 2, p. 424; Q. R. '84, 2, p. 43. — Henri Vast: *Les Grands Traités (Nimuegen).* — G. Bulard: *Les Traités de St. Germain (Louis XIV. and the Great Elector).*

§ 6.

ENGLAND AFTER THE PEACE OF NYMWEGEN.

581. The Popish Plot. — The Treaties of Westminster and Nymwegen were followed in England by a period of political turbulence and a series of judicial murders unprecedented in the history of a civilized nation. The leaders of the opposition with one hand received the bribes of Louis and with the other scattered broadcast the wildest rumors of French invasions and Catholic conspiracies. To banish Catholicism from the kingdom, to exclude the duke of York from the throne and to secure the succession to the duke of Monmouth, the natural son of Charles II., the so-called Popish Plot was concocted and worked by the earl of Shaftesbury and his partisans for all it was worth. His instruments were outlaws and perjurers of recognized villainy, such as Titus Oates, the brothers James and William Bedloe, Dugdale, and others. Titus Oates in August, 1678, bruited the discovery of a great Popish Plot. His depositions were taken before Sir Edmund Berry Godfrey, a Middlesex magistrate. A few days afterwards Godfrey was found murdered. London was wild with excitement. The popular outcry ascribed the murder to the Papists, who wanted to punish Godfrey for listening to Oates.

The murder mystery has never been solved. The most probable supposition is that Godfrey was murdered by one or more of the criminal characters working on Shaftesbury's side to give credit to the inventions of Oates and his fellow-perjurers. Godfrey had always been friendly to the Catholics and to the duke of York.

582. Charges of the Popish Plot. — The charges of Titus Oates, drawn up in 81 points, contained accusations of regicide, treason, rebellion, arson and robbery on a grand scale, to be committed with the knowledge and co-operation of the Pope, the Emperor, the kings of France and Spain, the queen of England, the duke of York, the Catholic nobility, the Jesuits and other priests of the island, secular as well as regular.

Before the Privy Council, and afterwards before Parliament Titus Oates and his associates deposed, that Charles II. was to be either shot at Windsor, or poisoned; James to be set on the throne as the agent of the Jesuits; Protestanism to be destroyed in England, Scotland, Ireland and the Dutch Republic. He showed forged letters of Jesuit superiors and even of the Pope, who, he stated, had already appointed the ecclesiastical dignitaries for England. Five Catholic peers, the queen's physician, the queen herself figured as members of the plot. He swore that Godfrey had been killed by two Jesuits in the court of Somerset House, where the queen resided, and his body had been dragged into the palace: he had seen the body; he had overheard a conversation between the queen and her accomplices about poisoning the king; two of them, he thought, were the dukes of York and Norfolk. When cross-examined about public persons, the witnesses betrayed absolute ignorance of their personal appearances. Taken to Somerset House and other scenes of the plot, they entangled themselves in endless contradictions. Yet an indescribable panic seized the credulous people. One of the charges was that the Jesuits, who were said to have fired London in 1666 with 700 fire-balls, were preparing to repeat the deed. Parliament pretended to believe every word the perjurers said, and protected and paid them. Among his friends, the king treated the plot as a big joke; in public he played himself off as a zealous defender of Protestantism, and signed one death warrant after the other of victims whom he knew to be innocent.

583. Close of the Cavalier or Pensionary Parliament. — When Parliament met in October, 1678, Shaftesbury unscrupulously upheld the Popish Plot. Parliament took the investigation into its own hands. The five Catholic peers accused by Titus Oates were thrown into the Tower. The secretary of the duke of York was beheaded for high treason; three members of the queen's household were executed for Godfrey's murder, all on perjured evidence. By a new Test Act which declared the Sacrifice of the Mass an act of idolatry, Catholics were excluded from both houses of Parliament. Twenty-one Catholic peers lost their seats in the House of Lords, and their heirs remained excluded till 1829. The excitement in Par-

liament and in the nation was increased by the appearance of Montague, the English embassador at the French court, who laid two letters before Parliament, one of which contained a promise of neutrality made by Charles to Louis XIV. for a three years' annual pension of 6,000,000 livres, and signed by Danby. Louis XIV. paid Montague 100,000 French crowns for this act of treachery and placed another 100,000 francs at his disposal as a bribing fund, to create difficulties for Charles II. Such were his methods to take revenge on Charles for his lukewarmness in French service since the Peace of Westminster, and at the same time to render England helpless abroad by its broils at home. The Parliament, so often bribed by Danby, now broke away from the minister and impeached him. The king, to save Danby and himself, dissolved the Cavalier or Pension Parliament after an existence of seventeen years, and ordered a new election (August, 1679). On the same day began the executions of priests and Jesuits accused of complicity in the Popish Plot.

584. First and Second Short Parliaments of Charles II., 1679 and 1680.— The Cavalier Parliament was followed by three short Parliaments, all displaying an increasing hostility to the court and the succession of James. The first committed Danby to the Tower and re-enacted the rule requiring the issue of *Habeas Corpus* writs by which prisoners secured the right of being either tried or liberated. Between the first and second James suppressed a rebellion in Scotland and Charles dismissed Shaftesbury from the presidency of the Council. Henceforth the conservatives or friends of the king began to be called Tories, the opponents of the king, or the liberals, Whigs.

The second Parliament met in October, 1680. Its members received with open hands the bribes paid by the French king to keep alive the domestic dissensions in England. The Commons passed an Exclusion bill, but the Lords rejected it by a vote of 63 to 30. Shaftesbury still had two of the most prominent victims of the Popish Plot in his power, the Catholic Lord Strafford and Oliver Plunket, Archbishop of Armagh and Primate of all Ireland. As no Irish jury, Catholic or Protestant, would convict the universally esteemed prelate, Shaftesbury had him conveyed to London. The execution and trial of Lord Strafford is one of the darkest pages of English history. Parliament, representing, as it did, the best intellect of England, found this innocent victim of unmasked perjurers

guilty of high treason on a manifestly fictitious correspondence with Jesuits. When Strafford declared his innocence from the scaffold, as every victim of the Popish Plot had done before him, the people cried: "God bless you, my lord, we believe you, my lord."

In the subsequent trial of Archbishop Plunket, false witnesses, "strong swearers," thoroughly trained in their trade, swore that the poor prelate who was unable to defray the expenses of his trial, had collected moneys and levied an army of 70,000 men to co-operate with a French invasion. Though aware of his innocence, Charles II. sacrificed him to his abominable policy.

Protestant writers of repute agree in branding Titus Oates and his helpers as the most infamous scoundrels that ever disgraced human nature. But they usually pass over in silence, that Shaftesbury, the leader in the Lords, Russel, the leader of the Commons, Sir William Scroggs, the Lord Chief Justice, the sordid tool of others, the Privy Council, the Judges, the members of Parliament, the leaders of Protestant thought, share this infamy in a greater measure, since they availed themselves of an imposture known as such to sacrifice thirty-eight innocent lives to their fanaticism or political ambition. The executions of the Popish Plot are a series of judicial murders, which, in the words of Lord Campbell, "are more disgraceful to England than the massacre of St. Bartholomew's is to France."

585. Third Short Parliament, 1681. — The king summoned the third of his short Parliaments, again predominantly Whig, to Oxford, in order to remove the members from contact with Shaftesbury's London mob. The Whigs rode into Oxford fully armed and wearing blue ribbons inscribed "neither papists nor slaves." — When Shaftesbury, supported by the majority of the Commons, declared that the only way of ending the dispute was to proclaim Monmouth heir to the crown, the king dissolved his last Parliament. A new subsidy treaty with Louis XIV. secured for him the enjoyment of 2,000,000 livres, for the first, and 500,000 crowns for the following two years. The people, more afraid of a civil war than of a Catholic king, were by this time on the side of Charles II. and the duke of York.

586. Tory Reaction. — The judges and juries, who hitherto had hanged and quartered Catholics, now turned their attention to the prosecution and execution of Whigs. Shaftesbury was sent to the Tower the day after Archbishop Plunkett's execution. Six

witnesses, five of them Protestants, charged him with the invention of the whole plot. The evidence furnished was undeniable. But as the city of London was strongly Whig, partisan sheriffs and jurymen succeeded in frustrating Shaftesbury's arraignment for high treason. In 1682 the court party contrived to elect a Tory mayor and Tory sheriffs. London and many corporate towns had to surrender their charters to be exchanged for new ones in which Tories alone were named as members of the corporations. Shaftesbury meanwhile, had gathered a number of desperate associates around him to murder the king and his brother. Seized at times with an almost insane terror, he despaired of success and fled to Holland, where soon after he died a miserable death (January, 1683).

587. The Ryehouse Plot. — A number of Shaftesbury's followers hatched a new plot to murder the king and the duke of York, after his return from Scotland in 1682. The attack was to be made from a farm house (the Ryehouse) close to the high road from New Market to London, when the king would return with his brother from the New Market races. An illness of the king which hastened his departure disarranged the plan of the conspirators. The plot was revealed by one of the accomplices (Keeling). The plotters were arrested. Their letters showed that they were in correspondence with Monmouth, the lords Essex, Grey, Russel, and Howard, with the infidel philosopher Algernon Sidney, Hampden, the grandson of the Puritan, and others. The same men, who had been loudest in denouncing the Popish Plot, and had sent dozens of innocent Catholics to the gallows and hundreds to the prisons, had formed a Whig conspiracy to compel the king by force of arms to exclude James from the succession. The members of the murder plot were executed on evidence furnished by Keeling. Of the members of the political conspiracy, Howard turned king's evidence, lord Essex committed suicide, lords Russel and Sidney were executed, Hampden escaped with a fine, and Monmouth was pardoned after an abject apology, but retired to Holland. The king who had increased his guard to 7,000 men by withdrawing the garrison of Tangier, now felt strong enough to dispense with the anti-Catholic Test Act, and to reinstate the duke of York as lord high admiral and member of the royal council, 1584.

588. Death of Charles II., 1685. — On his deathbed Charles II. made profession of the Catholic faith and confessed to Father Huddleston, who had saved his life in the battle of Worcester. He received communion and extreme unction, and died begging pardon of those around him, February 6, 1685.

Onno Klopp: *Fall des Hauses Stuart*, vol. 3, books 6 and 7 (*from the Peace of Nymwegen to the Death of Charles II.*). — E. Hale: *The Fall of the Stuarts and Western Europe, 1678–1697*, chs. 1-5, pp. 1-66. — Lingard, l. c. — G. Oliver: *Collections towards Illustrating the Biogr. of the Scottish, Engl. and Irish Members of the S. J.* — H. Foley: *Records of the Engl. Province of the S. J.* — Comtesse de Courson: *La Persécution des Catholiques en Angleterre (to Popish Plot)*. — J. G. MacLeod: *Some Truths about the Popish Plot*, M. '79, 3, p. 385. — J. Gerard: *Some Episodes of the Oates Plot*, M. '94, 2, p. 457. — O. R. Vassall: *Ven. Oliver Plunket, C. T. S. P.*, vol. 12. — Spillman: *Die Justizmorde der Titus Oates Verschwörung*, St., vol. 22, pp. 69, 170, 479; vol. 23, pp. 126, 252; vol. 24, pp. 237, 447; vol. 25, pp. 147, 278, 362. — Burnet. — Airy: *Hist. — Lives of Charles II. and James II.* — E. Foss: *The Judges of England — Danby Letters.* — Temple: *Memoirs — The Habeas Corpus Act, 1679*: Stubbs: *Sel. Charters, Appendix.*

§ 7.

JAMES II., 1685–1688.

589. James' Accession. — James II. was acknowledged by the English people without opposition as the lawful successor to Charles II. He retained the chief ministers of his brother: Halifax as president of the Council, Sunderland as secretary of State, Clarendon the elder and Rochester the younger of the Hydes as lords privy seal and treasurer, and Godolphine as chamberlain to the queen. He put the court on a footing of greater economy. James II. had at heart the eventual emancipation of the Catholic Church from all penalties in his dominions, by securing legal rights, both for himself and his Catholic subjects, to practice the religion of their fathers in all liberty of conscience. The king by proclamation released all who were imprisoned for conscience' sake. Some thousand Catholics and 1,200 Quakers left their prisons.

At the instigation of the earl of Sunderland James formed a secret board for the purpose of privately watching over the interests of Catholics. Into this board he called the Jesuit father Edward Petre, of the noble family of Lord Petre. Father Petre was remarkable for his prudence in the conduct of affairs, his energy and apostolic zeal; he had suffered in Shaftesbury's prisons, and enjoyed in a high degree the king's confidence. Lord Danby and the Catholic peers were discharged from the Tower. Most of the

"strong swearers" of the Popish plot had died in horror and despair, or were sentenced to a degrading punishment.

590. James' Parliament, 1685–87. — Parliament was summoned to meet on May 19. The House of Commons was overwhelmingly Tory, chiefly because the feeling of the country ran high in James' favor. The Commons granted him the full amount of revenues which his brother had enjoyed.

591. **The Landing of Argyle and Monmouth, 1685.** — During the first session the king and Parliament had to cope with two invasions organized among the Scotch and English fugitives in Holland. The earl of Argyle, a covenanter condemned to death for treasonable practices in the latter days of Charles II. had fled to the Republic. He now landed in Scotland with three ships to rouse his countrymen against James II. but found no sympathy outside of his own clan of the Campbells. He was captured and executed as a traitor already condemned.

Monmouth, the pupil of Shaftesbury and the champion of the extreme Protestants, landed in Dorsetshire and gathered a considerable army of peasants and townsmen around him. Noblemen and the gentry kept aloof. The king sent against him an army of 25,000 regulars and 1,500 trainbands, who inflicted a crushing defeat on the rebels at Sedgemoor, the last battle on English soil. "King Monmouth" was taken captive in the New Forest, and executed as an attainted rebel. The rising was severely punished. Many rebels and their abettors were hanged by the pursuing soldiers. Jeffreys, who had conducted the Whig trials under Charles II., was sent on a circuit in the western counties, which from the numerous executions was called the Bloody Assizes. Three hundred and twenty were executed whilst over 800 were condemned to ten years of forced labor in the West Indies. On his return to London Jeffreys was made lord chancellor. The severity displayed on this occasion caused very little comment. Parliament approved of the punishments.

The amicable understanding between King and Parliament was disturbed by two events. The first was the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes, 1685. The crowds of Huguenots who fled to England, filled the Protestant mind with suspicion against the Catholic king, and confirmed Parliament in the resolution to resist James' desire for religious toleration.

592. Attempts to Repeal the Test Act. — The second event which caused a breach between King and Parliament was the dismissal of Halifax. Halifax, implacable enemy of the Catholics as he was, refused to support the king in his plan of bringing about a repeal of the Test Act. In his place Sunderland was made president of the Council. Sunderland's supposed conversion and his pretended zeal for the cause of the Catholic Church concealed the treacherous design of making the throne too hot for James. When the king met his Parliament, and demanded a supply for the support of the regular troops, he added by way of explanation, that the Catholic officers whom he had appointed could not take the Test Oath; he hoped that the Test Act might be repealed. The Commons were willing to grant a supply for the troops, thus conceding the principle of a standing army, but they rejected any interference with the Test Act by a majority of one, 1686. James at first prorogued, and finally dissolved Parliament in 1687.

593. The Dispensing Power. — The king had now recourse to the Dispensing Power, which he claimed as a royal prerogative. This power had been questioned in the reign of Charles II., but no statute or judicial decision had declared it illegal. The appointment of the Catholic, Sir Edward Hales, as an officer of the army, was made a test case. Eleven out of twelve judges decided that a royal dispensation freed the appointee from all penalties, and that this royal prerogative could not be restrained by statute. Thereupon James appointed several Catholic peers and his confessor, Father Petre, privy councilors.

It was not F. Petre's ambition but the king's obstinacy which raised the Jesuit to this dignity. James' repeated petitions in Rome to confer on F. Petre the mitre or the purple were neither asked for nor seconded by the father. Baffled in this plan, the king resolved to avail himself of Father Petre's services as privy councilor. The Jesuit at first opposed the appointment, then accepted it only with the permission of his provincial, and several times begged the king on his knees to be allowed to retire from court and from public affairs. But James peremptorily refused to dismiss him. There is no evidence to show that F. Petre urged rash measures on the king, but there is positive evidence that he opposed such measures. "Long after, in his exile at Paris, James II. testified: 'If I had followed F. Petre's counsels, I would still be king of England.' The enemies of James II. have unscru-

pulously distorted F. Petre's character, and even Catholic historians have copied the calumnies. Documentary evidence, including the testimony of Innocent XI. has at length restored him the reputation of an humble, prudent, and zealous ecclesiastic.

In virtue of his dispensing power, James II. allowed some clergymen who had embraced the Catholic faith, to retain their holdings; appointed a few Catholics to church dignities; forbade Anglican clergymen to preach controversial sermons, as pulpit oratory since the prorogation of Parliament had assumed a violent tone; had bishop Compton of London suspended for his refusal to enforce the prohibition; permitted religious orders to establish houses and schools in London; interfered in the elections of Magdalen College at the University of Oxford in favor of Catholics; dispensed with all penal laws in Scotland, and received a papal nuncio with great solemnity.

594. Declaration of Indulgence.— The Declaration of Indulgence brought matters to a crisis. In 1687 the king without the concurrence of Parliament issued the first Declaration, granting liberty of conscience and of *private* worship to all dissenting denominations. Whilst the Catholics and the Quakers, with their leader William Penn, joyfully availed themselves of the liberty, and the Anglicans were furious at the concession, the great majority of dissenters exhibited neither gratitude for, nor interest in the measure.

William of Orange, in secret correspondence with the enemies of James, advised the dissenters not to accept a privilege from the king, by which the Catholics would be benefitted; Parliament would give them an Act of Toleration from which Catholics would be excluded.

The second Declaration of Indulgence in 1688 demanded the concurrence of all civil and military officers, and the reading of the Declaration in all the churches. Most of the Anglican clergy refused to obey the royal order. Sancroft, Archbishop of Canterbury, and six bishops petitioned the king not to insist on the reading, but James declared their intent rebellious, and had them conveyed to the Tower. F. Petre strongly advised against any persecution of the bishops; he was the only member of the Privy Council who did not sign the warrant. As the "petition" had been made public, the bishops were tried for publishing a false, malicious

and seditious libel. The verdict was "not guilty." The acquittal was received with wild enthusiasm; even the army at Hounslow Heath, where James had 13,000 men encamped, cheered at the news.

595. Birth of the Prince of Wales. — While the seven bishops were being tried, an event happened which changed the whole situation. Heretofore the Protestant princess Mary, the king's elder daughter, now princess of Orange, was considered the successor of James II. But in June a prince of Wales, Charles Edward, was born to James by his second wife, the Catholic princess of Modena. So bitter was the disappointment of the Protestant leaders, that they insidiously spread the rumor, that the so-called prince of Wales was not the king's son at all, but a strange child substituted through a Jesuit scheme. The atrocious calumny was at once made the principal means of agitation. William III., against his personal conviction, used the pretended substitution as a lever to further his own succession in England. Even princess Anne, James' younger daughter, married to prince George of Denmark, accused her father of this heinous crime, and would not listen to the most convincing proofs of the real truth. Accordingly, on the very day when the bishops were acquitted, seven English noblemen, the so-called "seven patriots," sent an invitation to William, in accordance with a request he had previously made, asking him to effect a landing and save England from a Catholic tyranny.

Onno Klopp: *Der Fall of des Hauses Stuart*, vol. 3, books 8-10 (from *1685-88*) — E. Hale: *The Fall of the Stuarts*, chs. 6-11, pp. 67-130. — "*Life of James II.*" *by Himself* (alleged or tampered with). —Lord Macaulay: *The History of England from the Accession of James II.* — *Stuart Papers Relating to Mary of Modena.* — C. C. Longridge: *The Guilt or Innocence of Father Edward Petre:* M. '86, 3, pp. 378, 525; '87, 1, p. 75. — J. G. MacLeod: *A Jesuit Privy Councillor*, M. '79, 3, p. 64. — Duhr: *Die Anklagen gegen E. Petre, S. J.:* I. K. Z., '86, p. 677; '87, pp. 25, 209. — Roberts: *Life and Rebellion of Monmouth.* — Mackintosh: *Causes of the Revolution of 1688.* — Daniel: *History of France*, vol. 4. — *On the Stuarts:* E. R. '72, 3, p. 171; Q. R. 82, 1.

§ 8.

THE SECOND OR POLITICAL REVOLUTION.

596. English Policy of Louis XIV. — The policy of Louis XIV. throughout the reign of James II. was to sow discord between king and Parliament, between James II. and his son-in-law, William of Orange, in

order to prevent English interference in his designs on the continent. Whilst he incessantly urged James II. to grant a general toleration, he bribed English lords and leading politicians to resist the king's religious policy. To separate James and William of Orange, Louis assiduously spread the rumor, and confirmed it by an official declaration of his ambassador at the Hague, that an alliance existed between himself and the king of England. No such alliance existed. Unlike his brother Charles, James always refused to enter into any compact with Louis dangerous to Holland or to the peace of Europe.

597. Preparations of William III. — Since 1686 William of Orange was in friendly communication with the enemies of James II. From 1687–88 he carried on a lively correspondence with the earls of Danby, Shrewsbury and Devonshire, Bishop Compton, Henry Sidney, Lord Lumley and Admiral Russel ("the seven patriots"); with Sunderland and with the two Hydes, Clarendon and Rochester. The former had been superseded by Tirconnell as lord lieutenant of Ireland, the latter was the head of the Anglican church party. William encouraged the bishops and the dissenters in their resistance to the king. After the birth of the prince of Wales he sent Zuylestein to the court of St. James, ostensibly to congratulate the king on the event, in reality to urge the "seven patriots" to invite him to England. The patriots advised William to insist in his proclamation to the English people on the *substitution of the child*, as his *principal* motive for coming. He did so in his published declaration in which he posed as the unalterable champion of the Test Act. The States General made common cause with him, and voted 4,000,000 florins to enable him "to play the part of Monmouth." Thus James was surrounded by a conspiracy of his own household, as it were, long before he had any suspicion of the fact.

598. Invasion and Treason. — Upon the appearance of William's manifesto James made far-reaching concessions. Sunderland and Father Petre were dismissed from the Council. But concessions came too late. Louis XIV. placed his fleet at the king's disposal, but James declined the offer. William III. landed at Torbay, in the West of England, where Monmouth had found most of his adherents. Thence he marched slowly upon London, and was joined by the earls of Danby, Devonshire and other lords. James set out with his troops for Salisbury to meet William. Churchill, the duke of Grafton and other officers took a solemn oath, before starting, to be true to the king to the last drop of their blood, and then hurried to Salisbury to betray him. Lord Churchill requited the extraordinary favors which James had showered upon him by fostering a

widespread conspiracy in the army and inducing all whom he could influence to abandon his royal master. Officers and courtiers flocked to the camp of William. Prince George of Denmark, James' son-in-law, went over to William after supping with the king. When on returning almost alone to London, James heard that his daughter Anne had set out with Lady Churchill to join the insurgents, he fairly broke down. "God alone can help me," he exclaimed, "for my own children have forsaken me."

599. **The King's Flight.** — The king secretly sent his wife and the prince of Wales to France. It was well known in England, that a party of lords and the Parliament wanted to separate the child from his parents, to bring him up a Protestant. The king explicitly stated he would not recall his son, if he could thereby save his crown. While trying to follow his family, he was stopped at Feversham, and returned to London. There he received an order from William to retire to Ham under the protection of his own guards. James preferred Rochester. Permission was granted with the proviso that William's guards were to have charge of him. The castle was left purposely unguarded on the riverside to invite him to flee. James wavered for a long time. He asked the advice of Lord Middleton and the bishop of Winchester, would his life be safe in England? Both refused to guarantee his safety. Then James took the step which cost him his crown; he fled to St. Germains, the court of Louis XIV.

600. **Interregnum Dec. 11, 1688 — Feb. 13, 1689.**— The Lords established a provisional government under the presidency of Halifax, and appointed William regent. In this capacity William of Orange summoned a convention Parliament. There were five parties in this Parliament. The Republicans wanted a commonwealth. The High Church party, already suspicious of William's Calvinism (though he received the Anglican communion), desired the return of James, but under degrading terms. A third party advocated the regency of William in the name of James; others advised the immediate accession of princess Mary with Orange as prince consort. Orange himself said, he would never be lord chamberlain to his wife; he would accept nothing but the government in his own name and for life. The Lords, then, suspended action till the Commons had spoken.

The Commons declared that James II.'s attempt to subvert the constitution and his subsequent flight, were equivalent to his abdication; that the throne was vacant, and that it was inconsistent for Protestant Englishmen to be ruled by a Popish king. After a conference with William, the Lords moved to fill the throne with the prince and princess of Orange each with personal sovereignty, the

actual government to be in the hands of the king alone. The Commons concurred with the motion, but insisted on a Declaration of Rights.

601. Declaration of Rights. — The Declaration of Rights accompanying the offer of the crown declared as illegal: the making or suspending of laws, the levying of money, the maintenance of a standing army without consent of Parliament, the exercise of the dispensing power, the ecclesiastical commission courts and the grants of estates forfeited before conviction. It permits as lawful the right of petition and the right of carrying arms. It demands frequent Parliaments, free elections, and freedom of debate. It condemns excessive bail and asserts the necessity of returning juries in all trials.

The Scotch Convention added the clause, that Prelacy was a great and insupportable grievance. The following year the Presbyterian church was restored by law as the established church of Scotland. William III. was formally proclaimed king of England, Ireland, and France, in the banquet room of Whitehall, February 15, 1689.

The second Revolution swept from the minds of Englishmen the Stuart idea of the divine right of kings. Parliament was supreme. It made William III. king, it could also unmake him. Since the passing of the Bill of Rights every sovereign of England reigns solely by virtue of an Act of Parliament. All the chief actors in the second Revolution were men of a low moral standard. The revolution was to a great part the work of bigotry, perfidy, self-seeking, treason, a revolting amount of ingratitude and base betrayal of filial piety. Of the two daughters who betrayed their father, Mary had no child to whom she could bequeath her royalty, and Anne saw the last of her seventeen children buried before she became queen.

602. Parliaments of William III., 1690. — The Convention Parliament constituted itself a regular Parliament, February 22. The oaths of allegiance to William and Mary were tendered to both Houses, and to all office-holders, lay and spiritual. A few peers, some members of the Commons, six bishops and about 400 clergymen refused to take the oaths. These Non-jurors among the Anglican clergy acknowledged James II. as their lawful sovereign and were deprived of their holdings in 1691. The Protestant Toleration Act, which William of Orange had promised to the Dissenters

before his landing, was passed by this Parliament. It exempted dissenting jurors from the penalties of non-conformity, but left the whole weight of the penal laws on the Catholics. The Declaration of Rights was adopted as a statute, with an additional clause which forever excluded Catholics, or claimants with Catholic connections, from the throne. The vindictiveness which the Whigs began to display against the Tories, induced William to dissolve his first Parliament.

William was not yet secure on the throne. In Scotland the Highland clans raised their standard for James II. and defeated a royal army at Killiekrankie (1689). The last resistance in Scotland was crushed out by the treacherous extermination of the MacDonalds of Glencoe upon an order signed by William III. (1692). All Ireland had to be conquered (1689–91).

The Tory majority of William's second Parliament (1690–95) accepted an Act of Grace issued by the king, which granted amnesty to all supporters of James II. not actually engaged in treasonable correspondence. It excluded, however, the Irish nobility. By the Triennial Act future Parliaments were to last three years. Since princess Anne had lost all her children, the last Parliament of William settled the crown on Sophia, princess of Hanover, daughter of Elisabeth of England and the Winterking, and grand-daughter of James I. and on her descendants.

603. Unpopularity of William III. — William III., cold and unsympathetic as he was, never became popular in England. The English army was part Jacobite, part jealous of the Dutch troops, whom the king retained in England against his former promise. Of 35,000 English soldiers only 6,000 remained in his service, whilst 4,000 went over to France, and the rest disbanded. The Church was exasperated by the Act of Toleration and the purely secular theory of government which triumphed at the Revolution. The well-known facts, that he, a foreigner, and the head of a continental state, had overthrown a sovereign of English birth, that he surrounded himself with Dutch statesmen, Dutch guards and favorities whom he rewarded with lavish profusion, that he showed undisguised partiality for Holland, that his main object was to fight Louis XIV. with English resources, while he cared little for England, her church and her constitutional rights, chilled all enthusiasm for his person. The immense subsidies voted for a war on the continent, the rapid increase of taxation, the creation of a national debt, the maintenance of great standing armies, the suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act owing to the discovery of Jacobite plots against William's life

the massacre of Glencoe, all added to the discontent. Besides the national prosperity rapidly declined. Exports decreased by one-half; post office revenues fell off one-third of the former proceeds. Rents were not paid, landlords were impoverished, and alarming bread riots broke out in the chief cities of England. The men who had made William king, including the "seven patriots," and even Churchill, now duke of Marlborough, endeavored to make their position sure in the event of a Jacobite reaction, by professing allegiance to James II. and plotting for his restoration, whilst they remained in the service of William. The Tory Parliaments manifested their discontent in unmistakable ways; they cut down nearly one-half the income which had been granted to Charles II. and James II. for life; they restricted the grant to four years; they recalled William's grants to Dutch favorites; after the Peace of Ryswick, 1697, they summarily dismissed the Dutch guards, reduced the army to 7,000 men, the navy from 40,000 to 8,000. The restrictions which William's last Parliament put on the future sovereigns of England, that they should be members of the Anglican church, should not leave the kingdom without consent of Parliament, should not wage war in defense of their foreign possessions, should not bestow offices and crown lands on foreigners, should employ ministers responsible to Parliament for their acts — were but so many criticisms of William's policy.

Onno Klopp: *Der Fall d. H. St.:* vol. 4, book 11 (*The Catastrophe of James II.*); b. 12 (*The New Succession and the Grand Alliance*). — Hale: *The Fall of the Stuarts,* chs. 12–16, pp. 131–191. — H. O. Wakeman: *Europe,* 1598–1715. — Mackintosh: *History of the Revolution in England in 1688.* — Mazure: *Hist. de la Révolution de 1688 en Angleterre.* — La Marquise Campana de Cavelli: *Les Derniers Stuarts.* — A. Shield: *The Orange Conspiracy of 1688:* D. R. '96, 4, 353. — Burnet's *Hist. and Works Quoted under* § 1. — Davies: *Journal: 1688–90.* — J. R. Tanner: *Naval Preparation of James II., 1688:* E. H. R., v. 8, p. 272. — On *Conduct of the Duchess of Marlborough, Evelyn's Diary. — To Louis XIV. and the Engl. Revolution:* E. R. '79, 2, p. 476; 4, p. 330. — H. D. Traill: *William III.* (12 Engl. Statesmen). — Torriano: *William III.* — William III.: *His Declaration.* — Doebner: *Memoirs of Mary, Queen of England.* — Strickland: *Mary Beatrice of Modena, Queen-Consort of James II; Mary II.; Anne, Queen-Regnants of Great Britain, etc.* — R W. Johnston: *Edward Hyde (Clarendon) and his Daughter:* A. C. Q., v. 11, p. 613. — Wolseley: *Life of John Churchill, D. of Marlborough, to the Accession of Queen Anne.* — Hennessey: *Engl. Liberty from the Reformation to the Triumph of the Prince of Orange:* A. C. Q., v. 18, p. 295. — Dicey: *Law of the Constitution.* — W. Bagehot: *The Engl. Constitution.* — Gneist-Shee: *The English Parliament and its Transformations Through a Thousand Years.* — Th. Davis. - Ch. G., Duffy: *The Patriot Parliament of 1689.* — Stubbs: *Bill of Rights, 1689; Select Charters:* Appendix. — T. B. Scannell: *The Engl. Constitution in Theory and Practice:* D. R., '87, 1, p. 45. — Stubbs: *The Act of Settlement, 1700: Select Charters, App.* — Cathrein: *Die Englishe Constitution (Ergänzungsheft to St., no. 15). — The Church in Scotland (From James I. to 1702); Hist. of the Cathol. Church of Scotland,* by Dr. Bellesheim-Hunter Blair: vol. 3, pp. 309–499; vol. 4, pp. 1–155. — J. F. S. Gordon: *The Cath. Church in Scotland from the Suppression of the Hierarchy to the Present Time.* — James Walsh: *History of the Cath Church in Scotland.* — *Histories of Scotland,* by Burton Tytler, Mackintosh (*Story of*). — R. Chambers: *Domestic Annals.*

§ 9.

THE THIRD WAR OF SPOLIATION OR THE WAR OF THE PALATINE SUCCESSION, 1688–1697.

604. Causes. — The causes which led Louis XIV. to a new aggression, were connected partly with his secular, partly with his ecclesiastical policy. They were (a) his desire to change the use of the re-united countries which the Truce of Regensburg had granted him for twenty years, into permanent possessions. (b) In 1685 the male line of the Palatine electors became extinct by the death of Charles, the grandson of the Winterking. His sister was married to the duke of Orleans, the brother of Louis XIV. The king claimed first a modest dowry, but gradually raised his demands so as to include nearly the whole Palatinate. (c) The Archiepiscopal See of Koeln had become vacant. Part of the chapter, bribed with French money, elected Cardinal Fürstenberg, bishop of Strasburg, who had played that city into the hands of the French. It was understood that Fürstenberg would place the resources of the great electorate of Koeln at the disposal of Louis. Innocent XI., after due investigation by a commission of Cardinals, rejected the election of Fürstenberg as invalid, and declared prince Clement of Bavaria the rightful Archbishop. Louis at once marched his troops into Avignon, and occupied this territory of the Church.

605. The Devastation of the Palatinate, 1688. — Whilst the Imperial armies were engaged with the Turks, and had just taken Belgrade, Louis, without a declaration of war, ordered the invasion and devastation of the Palatinate. In October, 1688, Melac entered the Palatinate, and obeying the orders sent by Louvois, inflicted a most frightful war on the unhappy country and the surrounding territories of Franconia, Trier and Koeln. The French officers themselves were amazed at the barbarous orders. The cities of Mannheim, Speier, Worms, Oppenheim, Bingen, one-half of Heidelberg, with their cathedrals, churches, dwellings, works of art; forty towns, over 1,000 villages with their crops, vineyards and orchards were committed to the flames. In the Cathedral of Speier the tombs were desecrated, robbed of their ornaments, the bones scattered to the winds, among them the remains of Albrecht I., and the Empress Beatrice, wife of Frederic Barbarossa. Brutalities worse than the records of the Thirty Years' War were heaped on the defenseless inhabitants; 100,000 families, homeless and beggared, were allowed to seek refuge nowhere except in France. No pretense of strategic

necessity can palliate this crime of Louis XIV. against humanity. The devastation of the Palatinate engendered the national hate of the German people against the French.

606. The Grand Alliance. — To meet the aggressions of France, the Grand Alliance, offensive and defensive, was concluded in 1689 between the Emperor, William III. of England (without the concurrence of Parliament) and Holland against France and her adherents, for the purpose of restoring the condition created by the Treaties of Westphalia and the Pyrenees. None of the members were allowed to conclude a separate peace with France. In a secret clause William III. and Holland pledged themselves to Leopold I., to promote the election of his elder son, archduke Joseph, as king of the Romans, and to support the Austrian claims to the Spanish succession. The king of Spain and the duke of Savoy (Victor Amadeus III.) joined the alliance in 1690. The unanimous election of archduke Joseph already king of Hungary, as king of the Romans, defeated Louis XIV.'s designs upon the imperial crown.

607. Campaign on the Rhine, 1690. — The War of the Palatine Succession was waged on the Rhine, at sea, in Ireland, in Italy, chiefly however in the Netherlands. On the Rhine the duke of Lorraine, the conqueror of the Turks from Kahlenberg to Belgrade, captured Mainz, the key of Franconia. William III., elector of Brandenburg, the son of Frederic William, visited Bonn with a destructive cannonade, and, reinforced by the duke of Lorraine, stormed its ruins. The greater part of the electorate of Koeln was occupied by the German allies. Lack of co-operation on the part of the allies and especially the death of the noble and unselfish Charles II. of Lorraine, prevented further German successes.

608. Ireland Under Charles II. and James II. — Charles II. had made a feeble attempt to do some measure of justice to the Irish owners dispossessed by Cromwell's settlement. But even the small relief granted by the so-called Act of Settlement in 1661 at the king's desire, was frustrated by the malignant bigotry of the duke of Ormond and the Irish Parliament composed exclusively of Protestant intruders. More than two-thirds of the soil fit for cultivation remained in the hands of the Protestant minority. As to religious freedom, Ireland enjoyed a period of tranquillity under the fair

administration of Lord Berkeley, though the penal laws were not repealed. The "Popish Plot" had its victims, the foremost among whom, besides Oliver Plunkett, were Talbot, Archbishop of Dublin and Lord Montgarret.

James II. resolved to redress the wrongs of the Irish Catholics. He recalled his brother-in-law, the younger Clarendon, and sent the earl of Tirconnell, a Catholic Irishman, as Lord Deputy to Ireland. No scruples prevented Tirconnell from carrying out a policy of restoration. He organized a Catholic militia, appointed Catholics to seats on the bench and in the Privy Council, and favored the Catholic priesthood. When the Revolution was accomplished, all Ireland was true to James save Londonderry and Enniskillen, where the Protestants had massed together. To call the war of the Catholic Irish against William a rebellion, is a grotesque calumny. It was a struggle for their legitimate and hereditary sovereign, to whom all had sworn allegiance, whose title, when they took up arms, had not been disputed by any act of the Irish Parliament, and whose zeal for the Catholic religion could not be considered a crime by Catholics.

609. Campaign in Ireland — The Battle on the Boyne, 1690. — James II. landed, 1689, at Kinsale with arms and ammunition under protection of a French fleet, and was received with enthusiasm at Dublin. Still the siege and blockade of Londonderry and Enniskillen had to be given up when general Kirke arrived with an army and fleet from England. In the autumn an army 10,000 strong, of raw and ill-provisioned troops landed under Marshall Schomberg, the commander-in-chief of William's Dutch troops, and in spring, 1690, a new army of tried English and Dutch veterans arrived, followed by William himself. James II. drew up his forces, 27,000 men, among them 8,000 French, on the river Boyne, near Drogheda. William came up with 36,000 men. The battle on the Boyne, won by William's 36,000, decided the fate of Ireland. James at once returned to France.

610. Siege of Limerick. — After returning to Dublin and receiving the capitulation of Waterford, William laid siege to Limerick. Bad weather, diseases in the army, and still more the dashing gallantry of the Irish general Sarsfield, who sallied forth from the city, swept around the besiegers, blew up their powder wagons, and destroyed their siege guns, induced William to give up the attack and to return to England. Churchill, now duke of Marlborough, came over and took Cork and Kinsale, 1690. The following year, to Marlborough's disgust, William gave the command to the Dutch

general Ginkell. Having taken Athlone, the latter attacked the combined armies of the Irish and French under St. Ruth at Aughrim. St. Ruth had ordered Sarsfield not to advance until he received a personal order from him. But St. Ruth fell, the order never came and the battle was lost. Limerick, held by Tirconnell, was now the last stronghold of James II. in Ireland. Tirconnell died before the arrival of the besiegers, and Sarsfield took his place.

611. The Treaty of Limerick, 1691. — Limerick was still far from being captured. The coming of winter, the prospect of pestilence arising from the heavy floods, the approach of fresh aid from France, made the situation of the besiegers very grave. Ginkell stood before the alternative of either starving or marching off. Sarsfield, too, saw no hope in further resistance. Accordingly, the Irish generals agreed to surrender the city and to terminate the war, if by doing so they could secure religious liberty for their people. The offer was readily accepted. The first article of the Treaty of Limerick stipulated that "the Roman Catholics of this Kingdom shall enjoy such privileges in the exercise of their religion as are consistent with the laws of Ireland, or as they did enjoy in the reign of Charles II., and their Majesties - - - will endeavor to procure the said Roman Catholics such further security as may preserve them from any disturbance upon the account of their said religion." The ninth article determined that "the oath to be administered to such Roman Catholics as submit to their Majesties' government, shall be the oath of allegiance and no other." Besides these religious clauses, the Irish Catholics were to be reinstated in their estates, privileges and immunities, as they enjoyed them under Charles II. All who submitted, were to receive full amnesty, the gentlemen were allowed to carry arms, and the professional classes to follow their professions. All Irish officers and soldiers who so desired, were granted free conveyance to France. Only the military clauses were fulfilled. About 14,000 availed themselves of the permission, and were formed into the Irish brigade which afterwards did splendid service for the French king. The religious and civil clauses were shamefully broken by the king and his Parliaments. Limerick became deservedly known as the City of the Violated Treaty.

The Articles were signed October 3, and on October 22 the English Parliament excluded Catholics from the Irish Houses of Lords and Commons by compelling them to take the Oath of Supremacy. The triumph of William consigned Ireland to the most hopeless and most degrading servitude. For the third time an immense proportion of the soil, over 1,060,000 acres, was torn from its native owners, to reward the soldiers and favorites of William III. or the friends of the English Parliament. Then followed a century in which the rights of the Catholics were trampled under foot as in no other country of the world, the century of the Penal Laws (see vol. 3, nos. 9–15).

Onno Klopp: *Der Fall d. H. St.*, vol. 5, book 13 (*the War, 1689-June, 1690*); book 14 (*the year 1690*); book 15 (*the year 1691*). — Hale: *Fall of the Stuarts*, chs. 14–16, pp. 149–191. — Daniel: *History of France*, vol. 4. — Wagner: *Hist. Leopoldi.* — Rousset: *Louvois*, see also § 2 — Ch. O'Kelly: *The Jacobite War in Ireland (1688-91)*, ed. by C. Plunkett and Edw. Hogan, S. J. — J. T. Gilbert: *A Jacobite Narrative of the War in Ireland, 1688-1690.* — Croker: *Contests in Ireland, 1641 and 1690.* — S. J. Dalrymple: *Memoirs of Great Britain and Ireland — The Battle of the Boyne and the Sieges of Limerick:* A. C. Q., v. 16, p. 845. — John Todhunter: *Life of Patrick Sarsfield, Earl of Lucan.* — C. O'Callaghan: *Hist. of the Irish Brigade in the Service of France.* — Lecky: *England in the 18th Century*, vol. 2, pp. 191–214 (*New Irish Settlements; Ireland, 1700-1760:* pp. 215–476. — *A True Account of the Proceedings of the Parl. in Ireland, 1689-1690.* — O'Conor: *Hist. of the Irish Catholics; History of the Irish People.* — Lenihan; Fitzgerald: *History of Limerick.* — O'Flanigan: *Lives of the Chancellors of Ireland.* — Curry: *State of the Catholics in Ireland.* — M. J. Brenan; Malone; Dr. Bellesheim: *Church Histories of Ireland.* — *Histories of Ireland*, by Joyce, MacGeoghegan, Mitchell, Plowden, Keating, Richey, etc. — B. J. Clinch: *How Ireland has Kept the Faith since Cromwell's Time*: A. C. Q., v. 11, p. 16.

§ 10.

THE CAMPAIGN ON THE CONTINENT AND AT SEA — PEACE OF RYSWICK.

612. Campaign in the Netherlands and in Italy, 1690–93. — Whilst William was campaigning in Ireland, Marshal Luxembourg defeated the allies under prince Waldeck at Fleurus by superior numbers (1690). The following year, Louis XIV. and Luxembourg, at the head of 100,000 men, captured Mons, whilst Catinat took Nice from the duke of Savoy. The two great battles at Steenkirk (1692) and Neerwinden (1693) were victories of Luxembourg over William III. Still in the former William was able to save Brussels, in the latter, to cover the retreat of the allies with his English troops. Namur, Charleroi and other fortresses remained in the hands of the French. In Italy the duke of Savoy was defeated by Catinat at Massaglia.

613. The Campaign at Sea. — In 1690 the English and Dutch fleets under Lord Torrington met the magnificent French fleet off Beachy Head. Unsupported by Torrington, the Dutch had to do nearly all the fighting. The victory belonged to the French, the honor to the Dutch, the disgrace to the English. The command of the Channel passed for a short time from England to France. But when Tourville in 1692 set out with 50 men-of-war and 500 transports carrying 30,000 men to invade England, he was defeated by the combined fleets of England and Holland under Russel, off Cape La Hogue. England again ruled the Channel and Louis gave up all further intentions to invade England. An English attack upon Brest was repulsed with great slaughter, 1694.

614. A Turn of Fortune.— The great success which had followed the French campaigns by land, began to flag in 1694. Louvois, the organizer of victories, had died in 1692. A terrible winter visited France in 1693–94. The country was exhausted, the people greatly overtaxed. Nearly 500,000 Frenchmen stood under arms. The nation was in the utmost distress. "The people were perishing to the sound of Te Deums." Though the French captured a few towns in Spain (1694) the presence of the English fleet on the coast prevented them from gaining a telling success. Luxembourg died in 1695 and was succeeded by the incapable Villeroi. William III., no match for the former, was a match for the latter. With the aid of German troops he recaptured Namur, the first of Louis' conquests that was retaken by force. The presence of 250,000 allied troops in the Netherlands warded off any serious attack by the French. These changed circumstances made Louis desirous of peace. Another strong motive for coming to terms with the allies was the precarious health of Charles II. of Spain and the prospect of the Spanish succession, which could not be thought of as long as the allied Powers stood united against him. Hence his restless moves to break up the Grand Alliance. William III. and Holland were the first to enter into secret negotiations with a special agent of Louis; the duke of Savoy, prompted by William III., was the first to break away from his obligations to the allies and to conclude a separate peace with the king of France. He recovered all he had lost in the war, and reinforced by French troops turned his arms against his former friends and forced a treaty of Italian neutrality on the Emperor.

615 The Peace of Ryswick with England, Holland and Spain. — Having made the first breach in the alliance Louis by proposing favorable preliminaries to be accepted at a stipulated time, induced the rest of the allies to accept Sweden as mediator, and Ryswick, near the Hague, as the place of the peace congress. He relied on the selfish spirit of Holland that

once before had betrayed the allies for commercial advantages, and he was not mistaken. He was aided in his plan of dividing the allies by the delays which the ambassadors of the Emperor opposed to the negotiations in order to save Strasburg for the Empire. Spain had become still weaker during these negotiations by the fall of Barcelona. Accordingly, when the term proposed by Louis had expired, the kings of England and Spain, and the States General concluded a separate peace. At the request of the allies, however, Louis granted a truce to the Emperor.

616. Terms of the Peace of Ryswick signed Sept. 27, 1697. — (a) *With Holland and England.* All the conquests made by France, Holland or England were mutually restored. Holland obtained a most favorable commercial treaty with France, and the right of strengthening the Spanish fortresses of the Netherlands with Dutch troops in the proportion of one-half of each garrison. William III. was acknowledged as king of England and princess Anne as his successor. By the promise not to aid the enemies of the English succession Louis gave up the cause of James II. (b) *With Spain.* France restored to Spain a great number of places "reunited" or conquered since the Peace of Nymwegen, including Luxemburg and Barcelona, but retained 80 places of minor importance.

617. Peace of Ryswick with Germany signed Nov. 1. — The reluctance of the Emperor to sacrifice Strasburg was finally overcome by the unanimous vote of the German deputies at Ryswick, and peace was concluded between Louis XIV., the Emperor and the Empire. Louis restored all the Reunions outside of Alsace, returned Freiburg and Breisach to the Emperor, Philipsburg to the Empire, Zweibrücken to the king of Sweden, Lorraine to the son of duke Charles V. (Leopold Joseph), the Palatinate to the lawful heirs (the Neuburg side-line of the Palatine House), disavowed Fürstenberg's claim to Koeln, and opened the Rhine for free navigation. Strasburg, however, and the whole of Alsace with its twelve imperial towns, were definitely separated from the Empire, and remained in the possession of France until they were reconquered by the diplomacy of Bismark and the armies of William I. in 1870.

618. **The Ryswick Clause.** — When all the territorial questions had been settled, Louis came forward with his famous demand called the Ryswick clause. In all the places restored, the Catholic religion was to remain in the

condition which had obtained during the French occupation. The Catholic religion had again taken firm root in many of these places administered by French officials. No personal right of the inhabitants was violated by the clause, whilst the inalienable rights of the Church were restored. Louis finally maintained his point in the face of the violent opposition of the German Protestant princes and the moderate remonstrances of the imperial ambassadors. He was not a little assisted by the fact that the champions of Protestantism, William III., the high mightinesses and the king of Sweden, having obtained their secular demands, no longer cared for the complaints of their brethren in the faith. Thus the clause remained a part of the Peace of Ryswick.

Onno Klopp: *Fall des Hauses Stuart*, vol. 6, book 16 (*1692*); b. 17 (*1693*); b. 18 (*1694*); vol. 7, b. 19 (*1695*); b. 20 (*1696*); book 21 (*1697 and the Peace of Ryswick*. Onno Klopp's great work contains the fullest account with sources of the life of Leopold I. and the affairs of Austria and Germany during these wars). — Baumstark: *Leopold I.* — Newbaus: *Der Friede von Ryswick*. Works quoted in §§ 1 and 2. — *Histories of Austria* by New; W. Coxe; Mailath; Huber, etc. — Macaulay: *H. of England* — S. A. Dunham: *Hist. of the German Empire* — S. P. R. James: *Life and Times of Louis XIV.* — L. v. Ranke: *Hist. of Engl. in the 17th Century*.

§ 11.

THE TURKISH WARS OF LEOPOLD I.

619. Leopold's First Turkish War, 1661-64. — When the peace of Europe seemed restored by the treaties of the Pyrenees, of Oliva and of Copenhagen (see § 2), a new war broke out in Hungary, between Austria and Turkey. An election dispute in Transylvania, a crownland of Hungary under Turkish protection, furnished the Turks a pretext to overrun the country with fire and sword. The absorption by Turkey of Transylvania would have imperiled Austrian Hungary. Leopold, therefore, aided Transylvania. Thereupon, the Turks, stirred up by the ambassadors of Louis XIV., advanced against Hungary with an army of 100,000 men. The decisive battle was won at St. Gotthard, on the upper Raab, by the imperial general Raymund Montecuculi, 1664. Sixteen thousand Turks remained on the field or were drowned in the Raab. It was the greatest victory by land which a Christian army had won over the Moslem for 300 years, and a turning-point in the warfare against Turkey. A truce of twenty years, concluded nine days after the battle, guaranteed Transylvania the freedom of electing its princes, and confirmed some disputed territorial rights to the

Emperor, but left the frontier fortress of Neuhäusel in the hands of the Turks. The advantages of this peace, necessitated by lack of provisions and ammunition in the Austrian army, were not in proportion to the success in the field.

620. **The Second Turkish War, 1682-1699 — Hungarian Affairs.** — Whilst the Emperor was fighting in the West for the sanctity and stability of treaty rights, Hungary was stirred up to disaffection and revolt by ambitious magnates and emissaries of Louis XIV. Emerich Tököly, a bitter Calvinist and cruel priest-slayer, strove to found an independent Hungarian principality under the suzerainty of Turkey. He was supported by the king of France who sent him half a million florins. He concluded a treaty with Mohammed IV., in which he owned himself a vassal and tributary of the Osmanic Empire, and was recognized by the Sultan as king of Upper or Austrian Hungary. He then raised the standard of rebellion, and at the head of 14,000 partisans took a few forts. Reinforced by 40,000 Turks under Ibrahim Pasha, he conquered the greater part of Austrian Hungary.

621. Invasion of Austria, 1683. — Meanwhile Kara Mustafa, the grand vizier, had made extensive preparations for an invasion of the Occident. At Belgrade Mohammed IV. held a general review and handed him the "Standard of the Law" as commander-in-chief with unlimited powers. The Turkish army numbered 160,000 regulars, 30,000 Tartar horsemen, and an immense military train. Leopold had only 28,000 men scattered over Hungary, and a field army of 32,000 under the command of Charles V., the exiled duke of Lorraine. Avoiding strong fortresses, and burning the habitations of men on their onward march, the Turks and Tartars made directly for Vienna, the capital of Austria.

622. **The Defenders of Christendom.** — Three men saved Vienna and Christendom from the last and mightiest wave of aggressive Mohammedanism: Pope Innocent XI., who, filled with the spirit of the Crusaders, most fully represented the solidarity of Christendom against the Islam; John III. Sobieski, who had previously fought the battles of his nation against the Crescent; and the great general and strategist Charles V., duke of Lorraine, commander-in-chief of the Christian army. Innocent XI. ordered general prayers for the salvation of Vienna. He appealed, though in vain, to Louis XIV., to send his armies against the common enemy, or at least to keep the peace with the Christian Powers that were willing to defend the Occident. He effected the alliance between Leopold and John III. Sobieski. The generous Pontiff allowed Leopold to raise a war tax on the property of the

Church, and personally donated the enormous sum of 1,200,000 thalers to the Emperor, and corresponding subsidies to the king of Poland. As his representative the Pope sent the saintly Capuchin Fra Marco D'Aviano, the trusted friend and adviser of the imperial family, to the Christian army.

623. The Siege of Vienna, July 14–Sept. 12, 1683. — The Tartar van arrived before Vienna July 13, followed by the main army which began the siege on the 14th; 10–12,000 regular troops whom Charles of Lorraine had succeeded in throwing into the city, and the companies of armed citizens numbering about 4,000 men under the command of the energetic count Rudiger of Staremberg, defended the capital. To increase the safety of the city proper, the defenders set the torch to the magnificent suburbs. High-born and low, clergy and laymen, worked on the ramparts. Bishop Leopold Kollonitsch was indefatigable in rousing the courage of the besieged, preserving harmony among the military and civil magistrates, superintending the care of the sick and wounded, and procuring pay for the soldiers. Vienna was completely inclosed by the Turks and the rich surrounding country devastated far and wide. Thousands of Christians were massacred or sent as slaves to the East. By the order of Mustafa 20,000 Christians were slaughtered in a single day in the Favorita, the dismantled palace of the Empress. Exposed to the incessant fire of the Turks, the ravages of disease and the scarcity of provisions, the defenders were reduced to extremity, 5,000 regulars and 1,600 city guards had fallen, 2,000 were in the hospitals, the Turkish mines had opened a wide breach in the inner fortification, when at length the relief arrived which had been so anxiously awaited by the heroic Staremberg. It consisted of 80,000 Austrians, Poles and Germans, and 160 field guns, under Sobieski, king of Poland, Charles V. of Lorraine, and other leaders, who had effected a juncture at Krems on the Danube.

624. The Battle of Kahlenberg and the Relief of Vienna, Sept. 12, 1683. — On Sept. 11 the army reached the heights of Kahlenberg, in sight of the city and the Turkish camp. On the morning of the 12th king Sobieski served Mass for Father Marco, and after Mass bestowed the honor of knighthood on his son, prince Jacob, in memory of the greatest day which he would live to see. The army moved in serried ranks down from the heights. They had

to cross three mountain crests sloping gradually toward the plain, and stretching like an amphitheatre around the camp and city. Every man could survey the whole battle. Sobieski and his Poles formed the right wing, Charles of Lorraine commanded the left, and the Saxons and other auxiliaries fought in the center. In several engagements the Christians repulsed the Turks who strove to oppose their descent from the heights. Onward they pressed to the very tent of Kara Mustafa. A panic seized the enemy, and with the setting of the sun the whole Turkish camp with all its treasures and war materials was in the hands of the victors. The Christians lost only 500 men, while 8,000 Turks remained on the field, and the rest of the immense army was in full retreat towards Hungary. Thus Vienna was saved and the Occident forever freed from the pressure of Turkish aggression by land, which had lasted 600 years.

Sobieski sent the "Standard of the Law," captured in Mustafa's tent, to Innocent XI. It is preserved in the basilica of the Lateran. Kara Mustafa withdrew to Belgrade, where he was strangled by the order of Mohammed IV. His skull is preserved in the arsenal of Vienna. Save at the French court, there was joy and congratulation over the Christian victory throughout Europe. Louis had confidently expected the overthrow of Leopold I., and his own opportunity of stepping into his place as savior of Europe and as Emperor of the Holy Empire. In October the combined armies of Sobieski and duke Charles nearly annihilated a Turkish force of 12,000 at the bridge of Parkany. Charles then crossed the Danube and stormed the ancient city of Gran, the legal seat of the Hungarian primate, which had been in the hands of the Turks for 140 years.

Tököly, still backed by the money of Louis and by the power of the Osmanic Empire, refused to avail himself of the amnesty offered by the Emperor to the Hungarian rebels, and carried on a campaign of blood and arson against the nobles who submitted to Leopold. Fifteen Hungarian noblemen were speared, 10 hanged, 96 beheaded by Tököly's order.

625. The Holy League, 1684. — In 1684 Leopold I., John III., Sobieski and the Republic of Venice concluded the Holy League under the auspices of Innocent XI. The Alliance was directed exclusively against the Turks, and could under no pretext be turned against any other power. Each of the three powers was to continue the war with its own troops and to retain the conquests made. None was allowed to treat or conclude with the enemy without the consent of the rest. The allies acknowledged Innocent XI.

as the Protector and arbiter of the Holy League, and bound themselves by an oath to the Holy Father to observe the conditions. Again Innocent contributed nearly 2,000,000 thalers for the expenses of the war, and continued his generous subsidies to the end of his life.

Cardinal Kollonitsch, the benefactor of Vienna, founded five hospitals in different parts of Hungary for the care of the sick and wounded, and Charles of Lorraine expended a rich inheritance for the same purpose. It was the first time in the history of warfare that private zeal and charity was developed into a regularly organized hospital service.

626. Campaign of 1685 and 1686. — The scanty success in the field, 1684, was followed in the next two years by a series of brilliant victories. The allies routed two Turkish armies and all the forces of Tököly, and reconquered the important fortress of Neuhäusel. A great number of rebellious towns surrendered to the Emperor, 1685. After another campaign of blood and arson Tököly was led off into Turkish captivity, because he had sued the Emperor for peace. The year 1686 became memorable for the siege and capture of Buda, the capital and most important fortress of Turkish Hungary, and shortly afterwards 7,000 men scattered another army of 20,000 Turks and Tartars. Ludwig of Baden reduced a number of Turkish fortresses in quick succession. At the same time the Venetians stormed Napoli de Romania, the Turkish stronghold of Morea (the Peleponesus). In 1687 the strong places of Dalmatia fell before the arms of General Cornaro, whilst Morisini took Patras, Lepanto, Corinth and Athens. The decisive battle was fought at Mohacs, where, 161 years before, Louis, the last heir of St. Stephen, had lost his army, kingdom and life. The Christian army fought with such bravery that only 7,000 out of 50,000 Turks saved themselves into the fortress of Esseg, which was soon occupied by the Christians. In this battle Eugene of Savoy won his first laurels. The result of this victory was the complete conquest of Hungary, and the submission of Slavonia and Transylvania to the Emperor. In 1688, Belgrade, the key of the Osmanic Empire, was added to the Christian conquests. In the grand Diet of Hungary at Pressburg Leopold confirmed the ancient constitution of the kingdom and granted an honest religious toleration. The crown of Hungary was settled on the male line of the House of Hapsburg

according to primogeniture. Archduke Joseph was crowned hereditary king of Hungary, 1687.

627. **Continuation of the War against the Turks.** — The successful campaign of 1689, in which marshal Ludwig of Baden defeated three Turkish armies, was followed by a year of disaster. The death of Innocent XI. (1690) deprived Leopold of his richest subsidies. The new Grand Vizier, Mustafa Köprili, was a man of great energy and ambition. A new treaty was concluded by Turkey with Louis XIV. by which the holy places in Jerusalem were given to the Catholics for the French gold that enabled Mustafa to wage war against Christendom. Tököly, released from prison, was placed over an army of Turks and Tartars, and invaded Transylvania. Belgrade was again captured by the infidels, possibly by treason. A bomb fell into one of the magazines, and before the panic caused by the explosion had subsided, all the powder magazines in the city blew up, and buried six regiments and thousands of inhabitants beneath the ruins. The victorious campaign of the Turks came to a close before the gates of Esseg, whilst Ludwig of Baden succeeded in clearing Transylvania of Tököly and his hordes.

628. **The Battle of Salankemen, 1691.** — In 1691 victory again perched on the Christian standards. 130,000 Turks under Mustafa lay intrenched on a hill near Salankemen. The Christian army, 60,000 strong, attacked the intrenchment on August 19. On Assumption day they had received on their knees the blessing of Marco d'Aviano from his Italian cell, as prearranged by an army order of Leopold I. The Christians, in the most bloody battle of the century, routed the enemy and captured the Turkish camp and armament. Twelve thousand Turks, among them Mustafa, and 6,000 Christians, remained dead on the field. This success was followed by five years of desultory warfare, purely defensive on the part of the Emperor, whose resources were claimed by the War of the Palatine succession, whilst the Sultan was enabled to continue the war by a cash subsidy of 4,000,000 livres, sent to him by Louis XIV. It was in these years that the active assistance, which Ernest August, duke of Brunswick, rendered Leopold, earned him the *ninth* electorship.

629. **The Battle of Zenta, 1697.** — In 1697 a new conqueror appeared on the scene in the person of prince Eugene of Savoy, whom the Emperor appointed commander-in-chief of the Christian army. He won the decisive battle of the war at Zenta, September 10, 1697. The Turks were commanded by the Sultan himself, Mustafa, the warlike son of Mohammed IV. Eugene attacked the Turks while they were crossing the Theiss. The entire Turkish infantry was destroyed either by the sword of the assailants

or the waves of the river. Camp and artillery fell into the hands of the victors. The Sultan fled in wild dismay. The terror of Eugene's name, and the news that Louis XIV. had concluded peace with the maritime Powers without the stipulated consent of Turkey, induced Mustafa to sever his relations with France and to offer peace to the Emperor.

630. The Peace of Carlowitz, 1699.—Accordingly the representatives of the Holy League and of Turkey met in Carlowitz, the dilapidated town of old Sirmium, 1698. The Peace was signed January 26, 1699. The Emperor received Hungary and Transylvania, independent of all Turkish interference. Venice received Morea and Dalmatia; Poland Kaminiec, and Russia, whose young Czar Peter had allied himself with Leopold in 1696, retained his conquest of the city of Azow. Tököly was allowed to dwell on Turkish territory. Two years later, when Louis XIV. called on him to head a new rebellion in Hungary, the Turks banished him to Asia Minor, where he died in poverty, 1705. The Treaties of Ryswick and Carlowitz restored for a few years the peace of Europe.

B. J. Church: *The Turkish Struggle with Cath. Europe:* A. C. Q: v. 22, p. 592 (*from Selim I. to Peace of Carlowitz*). — Onno Klopp: *Der Fall, passim; Das Jahr. 1683 und die folgenden grossen Türkenkriege.* — Maresch: *Das Jahr 1683*: H. T. B., v. 5, p. 179. — E. A. Freeman: *The Ottoman Power in Europe.* — G. Finlay: *Hist. of Greece under Ottoman and Venetian Domination.* — Stanley Lane-Poole: *Turkey.* — Sir E. S. Creasy: *Hist. of the Ottoman Turks.* — Malden: *Vienna, 1683.* — G. B. Malleson: *Prince Eugene of Savoy; The Battlefields of Germany*, ch. 9. — Leger: *History of Austro-Hungary.* — E. Szabad: *Hungary Past and Present*, part 1, chs. 5-6. — Mailáth: *Gesch. der Magyaren.* — Fessler: *Gesch. Ungarns.* — Zinkeisen; Hammer: *Gesch. des osmanischen Reiches.* — *Histories of Poland*, by Dunham, Caro, etc. — Arch. J. Dunn: *The Rise, Progress and Decay of the Turkish Empire.* — *On Prince Eugene and the Infidels:* Katholik '64, 2, 72. — *On Innocent XI. and the Turkish War:* H. P. B., vol. 98, pp. 569, 673, 774 (Maurer). — Maurer: *Card. Leopold, Graf Kollonitsch;* also H. P. B., v. 97, p. 178.

§ 12.

CAUSES OF THE WAR OF THE SPANISH SUCCESSION, 1701–1714.

631. Legal Aspect of the Question. — After the Peace of Ryswick the European cabinets were chiefly occupied with the question of the Spanish Succession. Charles II. of Spain was sinking and with his death the Spanish Hapsburgs became extinct. Three claimants to the crown came forward. (1) Louis XIV. as

the son of the elder daughter of Philip III., and the husband of the elder daughter of Philip IV. But both princesses had solemnly renounced their rights of succeeding to the Spanish throne. Louis XIV. brushed away these renunciations, because the dowry had not been paid, and ordered the Parliament of Paris to declare them invalid. (2) Leopold I., the representative of the German Hapsburgs, as the son of the younger daughter of Philip III. and the husband of the younger daughter of Philip IV. Both princesses had expressly reserved their rights of succession. (3) Joseph Ferdinand, electoral prince of Bavaria, as the grandson of a sister of the reigning king of Spain. Both parents had renounced any claim to the Spanish succession in acknowledgment of Leopold's right. This renunciation, however, was not acknowledged by Spain.

632. The Political Question. — The claims founded on inheritance were modified for political reasons. The naval Powers, England and Holland, would not permit the union of the Spanish monarchy either with the kingdom of France or with the vast possessions of the Austrian Hapsburgs, because such a union would make the respective states too powerful, or, as it was expressed, would disturb the balance of power in Europe. Accordingly, Leopold claimed the Spanish Succession neither for himself nor for his first son Joseph, king of the Romans, but for his second son, archduke Charles. For the same reason Louis put in his claim for his second grandson, Philip of Anjou.

633. **Partition Treaties.** — After the Treaty of Ryswick William III. to secure the much desired peace to Holland, began to play a double game. With the Emperor he renewed his obligation to support the Austrian claims to the Spanish succession, with Louis XIV. he concluded a secret treaty to divide the Spanish inheritance among the three claimants.

Charles II., informed of the plan, became incensed at the attempt of foreigners to divide his possessions during his lifetime without even asking his leave, and willed the whole Spanish inheritance to the Bavarian prince Joseph Ferdinand. Upon the death of Joseph Ferdinand in 1699, the king of Spain resolved to bequeath the undivided monarchy to archduke Charles. Against this arrangement Louis XIV. and William III. concluded a second partition treaty by which the duchy of Lorraine was to be annexed to France. The dauphin was to receive the Italian possessions of Spain save Milan which was to indemnify the duke of Lorraine, whilst

CLAIMANTS TO THE SPANISH SUCCESSION.


PHILIP III., King of Spain.
PHILIP IV., King of Spain.
ANNA MARIA, m. LOUIS XIII., Renounced their rights.
MARY ANNE, m. FERDINAND III.
CHARLES II. King of Spain, died without issue.
MARIA THERESA, m. LOUIS XIV. Both solemnly renounced the Spanish crown.
MARGARET, m. (1) LEOPOLD I. m. (2) CLAUDIA FELICITAS. No renunciation whatever at this marriage
Louis the Dauphin, resigned his claim to his son.
MAXIMILIAN Elector of Bavaria.
m. MARIA ANTOINETTA, Both renounced the right of the Spanish succession to Leopold. This renunciation not recognized by Spain.
JOSEPH I., Emperor.
ARCHDUKE CHARLES, representing Leopold's right. — As Emperor CHARLES VI.
PHILIP OF ANJOU, heir of Spain by the SECOND will of Charles II.
JOSEPH FERDINAND, Prince Elector of Bavaria, heir of Spain by the FIRST will of Charles II.

the crown of Spain with the other dependencies was assigned to archduke Charles. On the part of Louis the threatened partition was a scheme to drive Spain into the arms of France, because the Spaniards without distinction of party resented any dismemberment of the monarchy. The plan had its desired effect on the timorous Cardinal Portocarrero and the Castilian council of state. Against every dictate of honor and right, the Cardinal frightened the dying king of Spain into signing a will which left the whole Spanish inheritance to the duke of Anjou. A few days later Charles II. died, 1700.

634. Philip of Anjou King of Spain, 1701–1746. — No sooner was the king dead than Louis threw the partition treaty overboard, and claimed the undivided monarchy for his grandson by virtue of the last will of Charles II. The duke of Anjou peacefully ascended the throne of Spain as Philip V. At Anjou's departure from France, Louis XIV. solemnly reserved for him the eventual right of succeeding to the French crown, although the will of Charles II. required a separation of the two crowns. The new king was also proclaimed in Brussels, Milan and Naples. Early in 1701 Louis, aided by the Spanish government in Belgium, threw French garrisons into the fortresses of the Netherlands, turned out the Dutch garrisons, and thus, in one night, obtained all the barrier forts between France and Holland. William dispatched Marlborough with 10,000 men for the defense of Holland.

635. The Grand Alliance. — In 1701 James II., the exiled king of England, died. Louis acknowledged James Edward, son of James II., as king of England. ("James III." "The Knight of St. George."—"The Old Pretender.") By arousing the bigotry of the nation William utilized this step to rekindle England's warlike feeling, which his unpopularity had quenched. He was empowered by Parliament to speedily close the negotiations for a new Grand Alliance, and to raise the English army to 40,000 men.

The three principal Powers of the Grand Alliance were Austria, England and Holland. They were joined by the electors of Hanover, of Brandenburg, of the Palatinate and by other German estates. Frederic III. of Brandenburg asked and obtained as the price for joining the league the Emperor's recognition as king of Prussia (1701). Portugal and the duke of Savoy, at first the reluctant ally of Louis XIV., joined the Grand Alliance in 1703. The object of the Grand Alliance was to obtain satisfaction for the Emperor, and pledges of

security for the other allies. The allied Powers recognized archduke Charles as Charles III. of Spain. The three most prominent men who managed the affairs of the alliance, were prince Eugene of Savoy, the hero of the Turkish wars, and the commander-in-chief of the imperial army; the duke of Marlborough, captain-general of the English and Dutch armies; and Heinsius, pensionary of Holland, the leading statesman of the League.

636. Allies of Louis XIV. — The allies who made common cause with Louis XIV. were, besides Philip V., Maximilian Emmanuel, elector of Bavaria, his brother, the Archbishop and elector of Koeln, and the duke of Mantua, all three the sworn vassals of the Emperor. Louis XIV. found a very useful tool in Rakoczy, the stepson of Tököly, who stood at the head of a new Hungarian rebellion. In his endeavor to become independent prince of Transylvania, Rakoczy for a number of years inflicted terrible sufferings upon his own country and the surrounding Austrian territories. The necessary engagement of a part of the Austrian troops in Hungary more than once caused a friction between the Emperor and the maritime Powers. Louis XIV., who supported the rebellion by his subsidies, was the principal gainer.

637. Death of William III., 1702. — On the point of taking the field William met with an accident. His horse stumbling over a mole-hill, he fell and broke his collar bone. A fever set in, and he died, March 8, 1702. He had been even more crafty and unscrupulous than Louis XIV. in the choice of means by which to gain power both in Holland and in England. The power thus obtained he used with great patience and perseverance to repress the aggressions of Louis XIV., and to promote the welfare of Holland, and incidentally of Europe. Though personally not bigoted he became a cruel religious persecutor on political grounds. His Irish policy cannot be too severely condemned. William was succeeded by queen Anne, the younger daughter of James II., and the last reigning Stuart, 1702–1714.

Onno Klopp: *Der Fall, etc.*, vol. 8, book 22 (*The First Partition Treaty*); bk. 23 (*The Second Partition Treaty*); bk. 24 (*Europe at the Death of Charles II. of Spain*); vol. 9, bk. 25 *Europe, Nov., 1700, to Feb., 1701*); bk. 26 (*Europe, 1701; the Grand Alliance*); bk. 27 (*from conclusion of Grand Alliance to Death of William III.*). — Edw. E. Morris: *The Age of Anne*, chs. 1–4, pp. 1-40. — Macaulay: *Hist. of England; Essay on Lord Mahon's Work.* — Lord Mahon: *Spain under Charles II.* — *Lives of William III.* — *Lives of Leopold I.* — Wagner, Baumstark). — Gams K. G. von Spanien: *The Times of Philip III. and IV., Charles II. and Philip V.*, vol. 3, part 2, pp. 252–342. — J. Dunlop: *Memoirs of Spain during the Reigns of Philip IV. and Charles II.* — Hale: *Story of Spain* — *Innocent XII. and Charles II. of Spain (about the King's Will)*: H. P. B., vol. 83, pp. 25, 125. — Le Marquis de Courcy: *La Coalition de 1701, contre la France;* also D. R. '87, p. 235. — A. Shield: *Heroic Age of the Chevalier de St. George*, M. '96, 3, p. 16. — La Marquise Campana de Cavelli: *Le Derniers Stuarts.* — H. O. Wakeman: *Europe, 1598–1715.* — Strickland: *Queens: Mary II. and Anne, Queen-Regnants of Great Britain and Ireland.*

§ 13.

THE WAR OF THE SPANISH SUCCESSION.

638. Campaigns of 1701–1704. — The campaign opened in Italy before the Grand Alliance was signed. Eugene of Savoy won a few battles over Villeroi, and guarded the Alps against any invasion by Marshal Vendôme, whilst Marlborough took the fortresses lately garrisoned by the French, and barred the roads by which the enemy might approach the frontiers of the Dutch Republic. An invasion of the Tyrol by Franco-Bavarian forces was promptly repulsed by the brave mountaineers. Most of the strong places of Middle Germany were held by the troops of France and Bavaria.

The intention of the Franco-Bavarian forces in 1704 was to push on to Vienna and to compel Leopold I. to abandon the Grand Alliance. Marlborough entered into communication with the margrave of Baden and Eugene of Savoy, who had meanwhile returned from Italy, and marched his troops to the Upper Danube, where he met prince Eugene for the first time. The mutual confidence of the two greatest generals of the age at once ripened into a lasting and disinterested friendship. After concerting plans Eugene made for the Rhine to watch a new French army which was forming under Tallard to aid the Bavarians who were harassed by Marlborough and Ludwig of Baden. Meanwhile Tallard joined the duke of Bavaria, and Eugene who had constantly kept him in sight, effected a junction with Marlborough. At Höchstädt and Blindheim (Blenheim) the enemies met. The French and the Bavarians were utterly routed. Their loss was 28,000 dead and wounded and 12,000 prisoners. Marshal Tallard himself became Marlborough's prisoner. This crushing defeat broke the military prestige of the French, who for the last sixty years had lost few battles of any importance. Before the end of the year hardly a trace of French authority was left in Germany. The two electors of Bavaria and Koeln were placed under the ban of the Empire.

Leopold I. died in 1705, and was succeeded by his elder son Joseph I., both in the imperial dignity and in the government of the Austrian domains.

639. Allied Victories of 1706. — In 1706 the prestige of Louis XIV. received three heavy blows. Archduke Charles had landed in Lisbon,

obtained possession of Gibraltar in 1704 and of Barcelona in 1705, as "Charles III. of Spain." The principal towns of Catalonia, Valencia and Aragon acknowledged him as their king. Still the expedition was not at all to the liking of Leopold I., who was inclined to consider the re-acquisition of Italy as a sufficient satisfaction for his Spanish claims. But to prevent a union of the French and Spanish crowns, the naval Powers had insisted on the step, and had pledged themselves to conquer Spain for Charles with their own men and money.

It was the desire of Louis XIV. to finish the war in Spain by retaking Barcelona. The plan was frustrated by the appearance of an Anglo-Dutch fleet which forced his squadron to seek safety in the harbor of Toulon, whilst Charles III. conquered Madrid. The second and heavier blow was inflicted by Marlborough in the Netherlands, who won a new and decisive victory over the French and Bavarians under Villeroi and the elector at Ramillies. The allies lost some 3,000 men; their opponents 15,000 dead and wounded and 10,000 or 12,000 more by desertion. Louvain, Brussels, Mechlin, Ghent, Antwerp, Ostend, all Brabant and nearly all Flanders were taken by the allies. To defend his own frontiers Louis had to call Vendôme from Italy. Equally disastrous for France was the campaign in Italy, where Eugene and the duke of Savoy drove the French, though stronger in numbers, from their almost impregnable position at Turin, and swept them out of Piedmont. Milan fell an easy capture. In the following year the whole of northern Italy passed into the hands of the Emperor, and his troops marched into the kingdom of Naples, which concluded a separate peace with Austria, and was never again united with the monarchy of Spain.

Divided councils and local disasters made the year 1707 one of inactivity and loss. By a French victory at Almanza Charles III. lost everything save Catalonia. The French once more invaded and devastated the Palatinate.

640. Oudenard, 1708. — The Catholic inhabitants of the Spanish Netherlands became disgusted with the insolence of the Dutch commissioners, who provisionally governed them and openly boasted of their intention to annex the country. Accordingly

Bruges and Ghent opened their gates to the French. Louis ordered his grandson, the duke of Burgundy, and marshal Vendôme to advance into Belgium. Prince Eugene hurried to the assistance of Marlborough, and the two generals scored a brilliant victory at Oudenard over the more numerous forces of the French, and after a siege of 60 days, during which the gallant defenders had consumed the last charge of powder, reduced Lille the masterpiece of Vauban's fortifications. In the same year the allies conquered the islands of Minorca and Sardinia. An attempt of Louis to cause an uprising in Scotland by the landing of James III. was unsuccessful, as the fleet carrying the Stuart prince was scattered by storms and barred out by the defensive measures of England.

641. **Negotiations — Malplaquet, 1709.** — The campaign of 1708 was followed by a terrible winter. In France the people were starving. Louis grew anxious for peace. Pressed by the rising demands of the allies, he finally declared himself willing to surrender the whole Spanish inheritance, and to restore the condition of the Peace of Westphalia. But when the allies demanded the surrender of a number of fortresses in France as pledges for the evacuation of Spain by his grandson, he gave way to the passionate appeal of the dauphin, the father of Philip V., not to abandon his son, and broke off the negotiations. The heavy demands of the allies were a political blunder that could but exasperate the French nation and reconcile it with the king's policy.

Accordingly Louis XIV. successfully appealed to the patriotism of the court and the nation for pecuniary aid, and put an army of ill-clad and ill-fed but resolute men into the field. The allies under Eugene and Marlborough, fresh from the seizure of Tournay, attacked the strongly fortified position of the French at Malplaquet, and won the most bloody victory of the eighteenth century. Commanded by Villars and Boufflers, the French fought with the courage of despair. They lost 12,000 of their brave soldiers, but prostrated 24,000 of the enemy. No prisoners were made. The material result for the allies was the fall of Mons. The moral gain for the French was a revival of courage and confidence.

Meanwhile Charles III. won two battles in Spain, and entered Madrid a second time. But the people of Castile and Estramadura, who were equally enthusiastic for Philip V. as the Catalonians and Aragonese were for

Charles, flocked around their king, and reinforced by Vendôme gained possession of all Spain save Catalonia.

Onno Klopp: *Fall des Houses Stuart*, etc., vols. 10–13, books 28–36 (*The War of the Spanish Succession and European Diplomacy*). — E. E. Morris: *The Age of Anne*, chs. 5–12, pp. 41–114. — Lord Mahon; Col. A. Parnell: *War of the Spanish Succession*. — Stanhope (Mahon), Barton: *Hist. of the Reign of Queen Anne*. — Oliphant: *Historical Characters* (*Reign of Queen Anne*). — On *Campaigns of Eugene of Savoy*, H. P. B., vol. 81, p. 241, vol. 84, pp. 397. — *Eugene, Prince of Savoy:* James: (*Great Commanders*). — Malleson, Wilson: (*Illustrious Soldiers*). — W. Coxe: *Hist. of the House of Austria; Memoirs of the Bourbon Kings of Spain; Memoirs of Marlborough. — Lives of Marlborough:* L. Creighton; Wolsely; Alison; James; Morris (*Great Commanders*), Saintsbury; Wilson; G. F. Mackenzie (D. R. '94, 4, p. 402). — A. Legrelle: *Une Négociation inconnue entre Berwick et Marlborough, 1708–9.*

§ 14.

TREATIES OF UTRECHT, RASTADT AND BADEN.

642. Change of Affairs — Party Changes in England. — The greatest disasters for the cause of the allies were the fall of the Whigs, 1710, and the unexpected death of Joseph I., 1711. They changed the whole situation in favor of Louis XIV., and enabled him to terminate a most disastrous war by a favorable peace.

The two parties, Whigs and Tories, continued to divide the politics of England. The Tories upheld the Anglican Church, while the Whigs advocated toleration for Protestant dissenters. In their intolerance towards Catholics both parties were one. The Tories were opposed to the war with France, the Whigs favored it. The Tories were willing to leave Spain and the West Indies to Philip V., in a word, to sacrifice the interests of the allies; the Whigs were pledged to support the allies, especially Charles III. The queen was at heart a Tory, but in practice, being weak of mind and will, she obeyed the beck of her surroundings. In the earlier part of her reign the Tories, Marlborough and his friend Godolphin, high lord treasurer, were the guiding spirits of the government, then composed of members of either party. But as the Whigs supported the war policy, both inclined to them. Gradually all the queen's ministers, "The Cabinet," as they were called, were Whigs. For many years the duchess of Marlborough had been Anne's favorite. But the queen grew tired of the imperious ways of the duchess, and bestowed her confidence on a new favorite, Abigail Hill (afterwards Mrs. Mashem). She was a poor cousin whom the duchess had introduced to court as the queen's waiting woman. The influence of the new favorite, who made common cause with her relative Harley, undermined the power of the Whigs.

An external event, in itself of small importance, became fatal to them. A High Church preacher, Dr. Sacheverell, attacked in a sermon the "glorious" revolution as implying resistance to a king, and raised the alarm cry: the Church in danger! The Whig majority impeached him before the House of Lords. His sentence, however, was so light, that it amounted to a moral defeat of the Whigs. The preacher became a popular hero.

The queen took advantage of the general excitement caused by Sacheverell's trial to dismiss Sunderland and Godolphin, to form a Tory ministry, and to dissolve Parliament. The people returned a powerful Tory majority to the House of Commons. The heads of the government were Harley and St. John. Harley was made earl of Oxford and Mortimer, and the atheist Henry St. John, viscount of Bolingbroke. In the winter of 1710 they began their policy of hoodwinking the allies and bartering with Louis for a separate peace favorable to England. Calumnious attacks in the press (Dean Swift) against Marlborough and the "faction" (the Whigs) accompanied these secret negotiations with Versailles.

643. Death of Joseph I. and its Consequences. — The second event which produced a change in favor of France, was the unexpected death of Joseph I. As yet the States-General, queen Anne and the Parliament declared, that the welfare of Europe demanded the election of Charles III. as Emperor and his retention of the Spanish inheritance. Charles left Spain and was unanimously elected as Charles VI. (October) 1711–1740.

A week after the death of Joseph I. the Tory ministry accepted proposals from Louis for a secret peace negotiation. Charles had refused to treat without the other allies. The Tory ministers negotiated after the fashion of conspirators and acted the next 15 months as emissaries of Louis. Two treaties were drawn up in London, one for publication, to deceive Holland, the other secretly for the special benefit of England at the expense of Austria. The secret treaty signed by the queen, gave Spain to Philip V., Gibraltar and Minorca with the port of Mahon and great commercial privileges to England. This price for violating the treaty rights of the Grand Alliance was to be paid on condition that England induced the other allies to accept the French terms. Louis and the Tory ministers began to treat the other allies as their "common enemy." Holland was intimidated by English threats, to send deputies to Utrecht. The Upper House was gained for this treacherous policy by the creation of twelve new peers. Marlborough was deprived of all his offices

His successor in command, the duke of Ormond, received secret instructions to remain inactive.

644. Peace Congress of Utrecht. — The Peace Congress was opened at Utrecht in January, 1712. Louis XIV., relying on his secret compact with England, demanded Spain for Philip V. without any guarantee that it would never be united with France. In vain the representatives of the Powers expressed their indignation at Louis' demands; England prevented any concerted action of the Congress, so that the allies agreed to hand in their demands separately. This measure virtually dissolved the Grand Alliance.

Before, however, anything had been settled, death visited the royal House of France and altered the course of the negotiations. In less than a month three members of the royal family were carried off. The dauphine died first (February 12). Her husband, the virtuous duke of Burgundy, followed her six days later. March 8, the duke of Brittany, the new dauphin, died at the age of five.



The sickly duke of Anjou, two years old, was now the only prince who stood between Philip V. of Spain and the throne of France. Under these circumstances even the English representatives insisted on the permanent separation of the French and the Spanish crowns.

As soon as England learned that Philip V. was willing to renounce all claims to France, St. John, the viscount of Bolingbroke, concluded a separate truce with Louis. To overawe the allies Ormond withdrew the English forces to Ghent and Bruges, then in the hands of the Dutch. Eugene, deprived of English assistance, was defeated at Denain. The consequence was that Holland and most of the allies agreed to make peace on the terms proposed by England.

645. The Peace of Utrecht, 1713 — France, Spain and England. — The several treaties between the different Powers are

called the Peace of Utrecht. Spain and the West Indies were left to Philip V., who solemnly renounced his claim to the French crown. Philip had gained a firm hold on the affection of the Spaniards outside of Catalonia. The Catalans, who had fought devotedly for Charles III., were abandoned, without a word of intercession, to the vengeance of the Spanish government.

Louis XIV. confirmed the permanent separation of the Spanish and French crowns, acknowledged queen Anne and the Protestant succession in England, and ceded to England Nova Scotia (Acadia), Newfoundland and the Hudson Bay territory, reserving, however, the fishery rights in these northern waters to France. Spain ceded to England Gibraltar, Minorca and the so-called Assiento, or the right formerly possessed by Spain, of annually importing 4,000 negro slaves into America for thirty years.

On this article the Tory ministers insisted most doggedly, partly because the ministers were personally interested in the nefarious trade, partly to repay themselves for the expenses of the war.

To Holland France surrendered the Spanish Netherlands to be handed over to Austria after the conclusion of a barrier treaty. Lille and some other border towns were restored to France. Louis engaged to demolish the fortifications of Dunkirk, but the clause was not carried out.

Savoy received the island of Sicily and an advantageous change of boundaries in Upper Italy.

Portugal obtained a correction of boundaries in South America.

Prussia received an increase in territory and the acknowledgment of the royal title.

646. Peace of Rastadt and Baden, 1714. — As the Emperor and the Empire refused to accept the Peace of Utrecht, the allies reserved the Netherlands, Milan, Naples [without Sicily], and Sardinia for the Emperor, and the territorial states of the Peace of Ryswick for the Empire. Prince Eugene was wretchedly supported in his campaign on the Rhine, and lost Landau and Freiburg to Villars. Exhaustion compelled the Emperor to conclude peace with France in 1714, at Rastadt, for himself, at Baden, for the Empire. Austria retained Naples, Sardinia and Milan, and took possession of

the Netherlands after settling the boundary question with Holland. For the Empire the Peace of Ryswick was restored. The electors of Koeln and Bavaria were freed from the ban of the Empire and reinstated in their lands and dignities. The Emperor would not recognize Philip V., and therefore concluded no treaty with Spain.

Onno Klopp: vol. 14, books 37 and 38 (*The Years 1711 and 1712, and the Peace of Utrecht, 1713*). — Morris: *The Age of Anne*, chs. 13-15, pp. 115-138. — Wakeman: *Europe.* — Daniel: *History of France.* — Casimir Gaillardin: *Histoire du Règne de Louis XIV.* — Morison: *The Reign of Louis XIV.* (Fortnightly Rev., March, 1894). — James: *Life and Times of Louis XIV.* — J. W. Gerard: *The Peace of Utrecht.* — Hon. H. Elliot: *Sidney, Earl of Godolphin.* — John Ashton: *Social Life in the Reign of Queen Anne.* — Zimmermann: *England and Europe, 1666-1714:* St., v. 35, p. 31. — Henri Vast: *Les Grands Traités du Règne de Louis XIV.; General Works on the Period in Preceding §§.*

§ 15.

THE CHURCH AND THE STATE — SUMMARY.

647. Principal Pontiffs of the Seventeenth Century.

Paul V., 1605–21.	*Clement IX.*, 1667–69.
Urban VIII., 1623–44.	Innocent XI., 1676–89.
Innocent X., 1644–55.	*Alexander VIII.*, 1689–91.
Alexander VII., 1655–67.	Innocent XII., 1691–1700.

648. The Papacy and the Crescent. — The Papacy of the period remained in the front rank of European Powers for the defense of Christendom against the reviving aggressions of Islam. Clement VIII. (1592–1605) caused the war against the Turks to be prosecuted with zeal and energy. Clement IX. assisted the Venetians with large sums of money, and made great sacrifices to save Candia (Crete) for the Christians. The fall of the island in 1669 hastened his death. But foremost among the defenders of Christendom stood Innocent XI. the friend of Leopold I., and the arbiter and protector of the Holy League (no. 625), whose generosity and energy rivaled the crusading zeal of his illustrious predecessor, Innocent III.

649. The Holy See and Catholic Powers. — During the Pontificate of Paul V. the relations between Catholic states and the Holy See began to undergo a marked change. Venice was the first Catholic Power to assail the rights of the Church by hostile legislation. The Signoria was advised by the Servite Paul Sarpi, the theologian of the republic, and the traducer of the Council of Trent. He greatly inclined towards Protestantism. On the other hand the Cardinals Baronius and Bellarmin defended the rights of the Apostolic See with eminent skill and depth of learning. Alexander VII. restored the good understanding between the Holy See and the Republic of Venice. A conflict with Portugal broke out in the Pontificate of Urban VIII.

about the recognition of the House of Braganza. It was settled by Clement IX., who in 1678 restored diplomatic intercourse between the courts of Rome and Lisbon. Far more serious differences broke out in the days of Alexander VII. between Louis XIV. and the Papacy, and reached their climax during the great Pontificate of Innocent XI. (see no. 655–57). It was, however, in the eighteenth century, that the secularism of Catholic courts and their diplomats allied itself with the rationalism of the time, degenerated into a systematic conspiracy against the Church of Christ, and became one of the great causes of the French and European Revolution (Vol. III., ch. 7).

650. Urban VIII. — Urban VIII. for a time reversed the policy, which Paul V. had carried out in the Thirty Years' War. The latter had aided Ferdinand II. in his contest with the Bohemian rebels. Urban fearing the preponderance of the Austro-Spanish power withdrew the subsidies asked by the Emperor. But the victories of Gustavus Adolphus opened his eyes to the dangers threatening the Catholic cause in Germany and he willingly granted the requested help. It was during the Pontificate of Urban VIII. that the celebrated Galilei trial occurred in the courts of the Inquisition about the Copernican or heliocentric system.

651. Attitude of the Church towards the Study of Astronomy before the Time of Galilei. — It is impossible to do justice to this subject in a work like the present. The following facts must suffice to dispel some of the prejudices that have clustered around the question. Before the time of Galilei the Holy See not only promoted the study of astronomy but encouraged the scientists who taught the Copernican system. Cardinal Nicholas Cusa was the first towards the end of the Middle Ages to teach the heliocentric system. He was followed by his disciples Peuerbach and Regiomontanus. Copernicus, the pious canon of Frauenberg, exactly formulated the theory, and dedicated his great work on the Revolutions of the Heavenly Bodies to Paul III. Galileo Galilei, the father of modern physics, was nowhere more admired than among the highest prelates of Rome, including three successive Popes. Cardinal Barberini who later on ascended the papal throne as Urban VIII. remained his friend after he had begun to defend the Copernican system.

652. Changed Attitude of the Holy See. — The change in the attitude of the Holy See towards the great scientist was caused by his intemperate defense of the new theory and his attacks upon the traditional interpretation of Holy Writ without being able to adduce convincing arguments for the system. Whilst Galilei, apart from other errors, based his theory chiefly on the ebb and flow of the ocean, he rejected as childish the first really valid argument for the Copernican system, the law of universal attraction, foreshadowed by Kepler, and later fully discovered and formulated by Newton. The Church could wait for the elucidation of the physical system, but she could not allow a change in the universally accepted inter-

pretation of Scripture before the necessity of such a change was *proved*. This was the position of Cardinal Bellarmin and other prelates in favor of silencing Galilei. Bellarmin expressly stated that, if the heliocentric system was proved by valid arguments, the necessity would arise of changing the traditional interpretation of Holy Writ. Accordingly the hot controversy between the friends and opponents of the system induced the Congregation of the Index to reject the opinion affirming the double movement of the earth and the immobility of the sun as false and entirely contrary to the Sacred Scriptures, and to condemn, until corrected, all the writings in which said teachings were inculcated. A few days before, Paul V. had ordered Galilei, through Cardinal Bellarmin, a personal friend of the astronomer, to abstain from upholding, teaching or defending the Copernican system, and Galilei had promised to comply with the order. He made no abjuration of any kind, was not named in the decree, was subjected to no penance of any sort, and departed from Rome with an unstained reputation and with the praise of all who had met him.

653. The Trial and Sentence of 1632–33. — In spite of his promise Galilei continued to agitate for the Copernican system, and became still bolder when his friend Cardinal Barberini ascended the papal throne as Urban VIII., in 1623. In 1632 he published his Dialogues on the two principal systems of the world, a work in which he offensively violated, if not the words, certainly the spirit of the decree of 1616. He was summoned before the Inquisition, and charged with having broken his promise made to Paul V. Galilei made a partial confession, that he had gone too far in the defense of the Copernican system. The sentence of the Inquisition comprised an abjuration of and future silence on the controverted hypothesis, the prohibition of his book and the imprisonment of the author. This imprisonment was at once changed by Urban VIII. into an honorable confinement, first in the pleasant gardens of Trinita dé Monte in Rome, then in the palace of his devoted friend the Archbishop of Pisa, and finally in the Villa Arcetri near Florence, where he quietly pursued his studies.

654. Additional Remarks. — (a) The story that Galilei after his abjuration muttered the words: "E pur si muove," "And yet the earth moves," is a pure fiction. (b) Galilei was never subjected to any form of torture. (c) He was never thrown into a dungeon, but during both trials was treated with the greatest consideration and accorded extraordinary privileges. (d) The wording of the decree was unfortunate because it rejected as contrary to the Scriptures what *later on* was proved to be a truth of the natural order. But the tribunal cannot be charged with passion or injustice, because it decided according to existing laws. (e) The error committed was the error of a fallible tribunal. The infallibility of the Church or of the Pope was in no way implicated in the two decisions, since they were never signed or promulgated by any Pope. (f) The trial did no harm to the progress of science,

not even to Galilei himself. His retirement at the Villa of Arcetri removed him from the excitement of controversies which, in the pursuit of a true goal, had forced him on a wrong track. It enabled him to finish and publish his greatest work, The Dialogue Concerning the New Sciences.

655. Church Policy of Louis XIV.— The Four Gallican Articles, 1682.— Louis XIV. attacked the rights of the Church with the same recklessness with which he attacked foreign nations. He claimed, in the first place, the right of the regalia over 60 bishoprics, i. e., the right of presenting candidates to ecclesiastical benefices and of appropriating the church revenues during a vacancy. The Holy See was bound to resist the often rejected claim. To exercise a stronger pressure upon the Pope, Louis summoned an assembly of the French clergy. Thirty-four court bishops and thirty-seven clergymen met at Paris, all adherents of the so-called Gallican Liberties. The Gallican Liberties were nothing less than the attempted transfer by the clergy of France of church jurisdiction to the state, and the sacrifice of papal rights and authority to the secular power. Bossuet, bishop of Meaux, drew up a declaration concerning the extent of the papal power in France, to which were annexed the famous Four Gallican Articles which proclaimed: (1) That the king is independent of the Pope in all temporal matters. But by temporal matters the Gallicans understood many ecclesiastical and some even purely spiritual rights, (2) that the Pope is subject to a General Council, (3) that the Pope is bound to respect the Gallican Liberties, (4) that papal decrees in matters of faith are infallible only when supported by the whole Church. By this clause the infallibility of the Pope was denied. It was by royal edict and by main force that the clergy was compelled to subscribe and the Sorbonne to register the Declaration and the Four Articles. The Apostolic See first protested against these schismatical efforts, and subsequently rejected the Declaration as null and void. Innocent XII. induced the king to withdraw this edict.

About Jansenism, which grew strong in France during this reign, see Vol. III., p. 108, nos. 157 and 158.

656. The Right of Sanctuary. — Another object of dispute was the right of sanctuary by virtue of which the residences of the ambassadors in Rome had become dens of criminals. The Pope desired to abolish the scandalous abuse. All the great Powers save France readily acquiesced in the reform. Louis XIV. determined to maintain the right of sanctuary. For this purpose a special ambassador entered Rome like a conquered city at the head of a large body of French troops to assert the claims of his sovereign. Innocent XI. excommunicated the envoy and closed the French church in which he worshiped, whilst Louis XIV. retaliated by arresting the papal nuncio at Paris, and by taking forcible possession of Avignon and Venaissin. Under Alexander VIII. when political disasters overwhelmed him, he finally relinquished the privilege of asylum.

657. Louis XIV. and the Huguenots — From the time, when Louis XIV. had taken the reins of power into his own hands, he began to curtail the privileges of the Huguenots. In 1681 he adopted severer measures. Whilst he offered special privileges to those who renounced Calvinism, he deprived Huguenots of many civil rights. Twice as many soldiers, as could be lawfully quartered with householders, were billeted on the Huguenots; but in case they changed their religion, they were entirely freed from the burden for two years. Insurrections broke out in several districts. They were put down with merciless severity by dragoons, Louvois' "booted missionaries" (Dragonades).

Finally in 1685 the Edict of Nantes was revoked, the Calvinist churches were closed or demolished, and the preachers who remained Calvinists banished from France. Laymen were forbidden to emigrate. Still from 48,000 to 60,000 found their way into Germany, Holland and England. The chancellor Letellier was the chief promoter of the revocation. Innocent XI. and the French Jesuits were opposed to the revocation and to any policy of coercion; the court bishops, the Parliament and the Sorbonne, favored still severer measures. The suppression of the Edict of Nantes profoundly agitated Europe. In Germany it put a stop to a widespread movement for religious reunion. In the Dutch Republic it led to retaliations and local persecutions of the Catholics. In England it filled the Protestant mind with suspicions against the Catholic king, and invited Parliament to resist James' desire for religious toleration.

658 Character of Louis XIV., and his Reign. — The judgments on Louis XIV. are contradictory. His admirers are liable to forget his unscrupulousness in the choice of the means with which he pursued his ambition. His enemies do not give him credit for his better qualities. In the later years of his life he corrected many of his earlier faults, and reformed his private life. France under his rule rose to be the first nation of Europe and called him "the Great." Louis was an indefatigable worker, and in all questions gave the final decision. He had in a high degree the gift of discernment and surrounded himself with the most eminent men of his kingdom. He listened to the praises, but also to the rebukes of the greatest pulpit orators of France, Bossuet, Fénélon, Bourdaloue, Massillon. The poets of his age, the most brilliant period of French literature, Corneille, Racine, Molière, La Fontaine, Boileau, flourished through a great part of his reign and drew their inspiration from his patronage. Industry and commerce, navigation and colonial extension, and the most heroic missionary enterprises in North America, had his hearty support. The grand buildings which he erected are still the admiration of the tourist. The disasters of his last war humbled and mellowed his character, and made him seek, with greater fervor, the consolations of religion. Still, the sum total of his policy proved disastrous to France herself, and prepared the way for the French Revolution.

659. **Summary** — Freeman in his *General Sketch* (p. 301) thus sums up the state of Europe at the end of this period: "During this period, France gained a great increase of territory." "The great Spanish monarchy was divided, all its outlying possessions in Europe being separated from Spain." "Great Britain for the first time won a footing in the Mediterranean. In Germany the Emperors became mere Austrian princes: but, as Austrian princes, they gained a great increase of power, both in Italy, from which they had so long been shut out, and in Southeastern Europe as kings of Hungary. In Northern Germany also we see the beginning of a great and more strictly German power in the growth of Brandenburg or Prussia." The power of Sweden, Poland and Turkey was waning, whilst the greatness of Russia was just beginning. In the way of learning Germany had the great scholars Leibnitz and Kepler, Italy its Galileo Galilei, England its Newton. Literature or belles-lettres since the reign of James II. was represented after Milton's death by Dryden, Pope, Addison, Swift, Defoe, Steele, etc. The poets of the age, both in France and England, were imitators of classical models. Alongside of this school another school began to rise after the Peace of Utrecht, that of the freethinkers and infidels, represented by Bolingbroke, Tindal, Rochester and others, whose destructive teachings reacted on the French, as the authors of the earlier reign of Louis XIV. had reacted on the English. When Louis XIV. died, Voltaire was just of age, and Rousseau was in the nursery. Both became the apostles of the French Revolution."

General Histories of the Period, quoted in the chapter. — R. Parsons, D. D.: *Studies*, vol. 4. — *The Pontificate of Paul V.* — *The Interdict of Venice*, etc., p. 1; *Pope Urban VIII.; The Thirty Years' War*, p. 48; *Galileo*, p. 81; *Jansenism*, p. 108; *Louis XIV. and the Holy See*, p. 200; *Gallicanism. The Declaration of 1682*, p. 229; *The Revocation of the Edict of Nantes*, p. 271; see also: St., v. 31, pp. 268, 400, 519. — *Louis XIV. and the Holy See:* M. v. 10, p. 593. — Henry W. Wilberforce: *The Gallican Assembly of 1682* (The Church and the Empires). *On Gallican Declaration of 1682:* Katholik, 66, 1, pp. 11, 150, 280. — F. H. Kroll: *The Causes of the Jansenist Heresy:* A. C. Q., v. 10, p. 577. — *On the Jansenists:* Bauer, St. v. 4, pp. 265, 331. — *On Gallicanism:* Bauer, vol. 3, p. 528; vol. 5, p. 31 (*Measures against the Sorbonne*), 240, 322 (*Declaration of 1682*). — Card. Basset: *Bossuet.* — On *Bossuet and Gallicanism:* I. K. Z., '78, p. 609, etc. — F. R. Wegg-Prosser: *Galileo and His Judges.* — Henri de l'Epinois: *Les pièces du procès de Galilée précédées du avant-propos.* — *The Acts of the Process*, also published by D. Berti (*Il processo originale*), and K. v. Gebler (*Die Acten des Gal. Processes*). — Gebler-Sturge: *Galileo-Galilei and the Roman Curia.* — Sedley Taylor: *Galilei and the Inquisition; Academy*, '77, Feby. — A. Mezières: *Revue des Deux-Mondes*, '76, Oct. — G. Schneeman, S. J.: *G. Galilei und der römische Stuhl:* St. v. 14, pp. 113, 254, 389. — Rt. Rev. P. N. Lynch: *Galileo Galilei and the Copernican System:* A. C. Q., v. 7, p. 85. — *The History of Galileo:* M. v. 8, pp. 262, 348; v. 8, pp. pp. 247, 359. — *On Galileo Galilei:* F. D. R. '65, 4; '71, 2 and 3; '99, 3. — Dr. K. Grisar, S. J.: *Galileistudien;* also I. K. '78, Z. pp. 65, 185, 673. — Bossuet: *History of the Variations of the Protest. Church.* — *General Histories, and Church Histories.*

CHIEF RULERS OF THE PERIOD.

France, House of Bourbon.

LOUIS XIV., 1643–1715.

Sweden, House of Wasa.

CHRISTINA, 1632–1654

House of Zweibrücken, 1654–1718 (1751).

CHARLES X. GUSTAVUS, 1654–1660.

CHARLES XI., 1660–1697.

Empire and Austria, H. of Hapsburg.

LEOPOLD I., 1658–1705.

JOSEPH I., 1705–1711.

CHARLES VI., 1711–1740.

Prussia, H of Brandenburg.

Frederic William, the Great Elector, 1640–1688.

Frederic III, 1688–1713, since 1701, **FREDERIC I. KING OF PRUSSIA.**

England, House of Stuart (1603–1714).

The Commonwealth, 1649–1660.

CHARLES II., 1660–1685.

JAMES II., 1685–1688.

WILLIAM III., 1689–1702 and **MARY** (d. 1694).

ANNE, 1702–1714.

Spain, **HOUSE OF HAPSBURG.**

PHILIP IV., 1621–1665.

CHARLES II., 1665–1700.

House of Bourbon.

Philip V , 1701–1746

Poland.

JOHN SOBIESKI, 1674–1696

CHIEF WARS OF THE PERIOD.

1. THE ANGLO-DUTCH WAR, 1665–67.

Causes.— (1) Dutch irritation at the *Navigation Act.* (2) Trade quarrels in the *East* and *West Indies* and in *Africa.* (3) The conquest of New Amsterdam (New York). (4) Personal grudge of Charles II. against Holland.

Alliances.	*Battles.*	*Victory of*	*Treaties of Peace.*
Charles II. and *Bernard of Galen*, Bishop of Münster, against the *Dutch Republic* (*John de Witt*) secretly allied with *Louis XIV.*	Naval battle **OFF THE DUNES** (drawn battle), 1666. Off the coast of *Norfolk*, 1666. The disaster of Chatham.	**DE RUYTER** and **TROMP** against *Prince Rupert* and *Albemarle* (Monk). English over Dutch. *De Ruyter* over *English.*	**PEACE OF BREDA**, 1667. Each nation retained the conquests made up to May, 1667. Modification of the *Navigation Act:* Dutch vessels allowed to carry *Dutch, Flemish* and *German* goods to England.

2. LOUIS XIV.'S FIRST WAR OF SPOLIATION, AGAINST THE SPANISH NETHERLANDS, 1667–1668.

Cause —Excluded by the will of *Philip IV.* from the Spanish succession which he coveted, **LOUIS XIV** claimed the *Spanish Netherlands* by the so-called *Right of Devolution.*

CHIEF WARS OF THE PERIOD. — *Continued.*

The **TRIPLE ALLIANCE** between *Holland*, *England* and *Sweden*, to force France to make peace, Jan., 1668.

Conquest of the southern Netherlands by Louis XIV., and Turenne, and of the Free County by Condé.

The **PEACE OF AACHEN.** Louis XIV. obtained a belt of twelve fortresses in the *southern Netherlands* and restored the *Free County* to *Spain*. The question of the *Spanish Succession* deferred, 1668.

3. SECOND WAR OF SPOLIATION, AGAINST HOLLAND, 1672–1679.

Causes — (1) The violent resentment of *Louis XIV.* against *Holland* (2) His success in breaking up the *Triple Alliance.*

France, *England* and *Sweden*, *Koeln* and *Münster*, against *Holland*, *Spain*, the *Emperor*, *Denmark*, and the *Elector of Brandenburg* and the *Duke of Lorraine* (**FIRST GREAT COALITION**, 1673).

Conquest of *southern Holland* by *Louis*, *Turenne* and *Condé*. Murder of *De Witt*. **WILLIAM III.** at the head of the State, 1672.

The *Dutch Republic* and the right bank of the *Rhine* freed of the enemy, 1673.

TURENNE'S brilliant campaign on the **RHINE**, 1674. *Fehrbellin*, 1675: *Brandenburg* over the *Swedes*. *Sasbach* (Baden), 1675: *Fall of Turenne.* Desultory warfare, 1676–78.

Münster and *Koeln* made peace, 1673. **PEACE OF WESTMINSTER**. *Holland* yielded the English conquests outside of Europe, 1674.

PEACE OF NYMWEGEN, 1678–79. (a) *Holland* received back its *European* territory. (b) *Louis* retained the *Free County* and a number of towns in *Flanders* and restored the rest of his conquests to *Spain*. (c) *Leopold I.* ceded *Philipsburg* to *Louis XIV*. (d) The status of the *Peace of Westphalia* re-established for the rest of the allies.

PEACE OF GERMAIN-EN-LAYE, 1679 *Brandenburg* had to restore the bulk of his conquests to *Sweden.*

THE REUNIONS AND THE TRUCE OF REGENSBURG (RATISBON), 1680–1684. *Louis on the summit of his power.*

4. THIRD WAR OF SPOLIATION, WAR OF THE PALATINE SUCCESSION, 1688–1697.

Causes. — (1) The desire of Louis to change the *use* of the reunited places into *permanent possessions.* (2) Louis' claim to succeed in the *Palatinate* because the sister of the *last Palsgrave* was the wife of his brother, the *Duke of Orleans.* (3) The rejection by the Holy See of his candidate, Cardinal Fürstenberg, to the Archbishopric of Köln. Occupation of Avignon.

The *Grand Alliance* between the *Emperor*, *William III.* of England *Holland*, *Spain*, *Sweden* and *Savoy* (*Victor Amadeus III*), the *Palatinate*, *Bavaria* and *Saxony* against *France* and *James II*, concluded between 1698–90.

The **DEVASTATION of the PALATINATE**, 1688

Battle on *The Boyne*, 1690. *William III.* over *James II.*

FALL AND TREATY OF LIMERICK, 1691.

Fleurus, 1690.

Luxembourg over allies under *Waldeck.*

Off **CAPE LA HOGUE** 1692.

Russel over Adm. *Tourville.*

The **TREATY OF LIMERICK**, 1691, guaranteeing freedom of worship to Catholics, shamefully broken by *William III.* and *The Parliament.* Separate *Peace of Turin* between *France* and *Savoy*, 1696. Restoration of conquests to the Duke of Savoy; the Duke declares his neutrality.

SKEENKIRKE, 1692. **NEERWINDEN**, 1693. Recapture of *Namur*, 1695, by **WILLIAM III.**	*Luxembourg* over *William III.*	**PEACE OF RYSWICK**, 1697. (1) Restoration of conquests between *France* and *England* and *Holland*. *William III.* acknowledged as *King of England*, and *Anne* as his successor. (2) The chief fortresses of the *Spanish Netherlands* to be garrisoned with *Dutch* troops. (3) All conquered or reunited places were restored to the *Empire*, *Spain* and *Sweden*, save *Alsace* and *Strasburg*, and 82 minor Spanish places. (4) *Lorraine* restored to Duke *Leopold*. (5) Free navigation established on the *Rhine*. The **RYSWICK CLAUSE** saved the rights of the *Catholic Church*.

THE WAR OF THE SPANISH SUCCESSION, 1701–1714.

Claimants: 1. **LEOPOLD I.** claimed the Spanish succession for his second son, **ARCHD. CHARLES.** 2. **LOUIS XIV.** for his second grandson, **PHILIP OF ANJOU.** 3. *Joseph Ferdinand of Bavaria*, the choice of **CHARLES II.** of Spain. After Joseph Ferdinand's death, Charles II. willed the whole Spanish inheritance to **PHILIP OF ANJOU.**

Principal Cause: The breach of the partition treaty by which *Louis XIV.* and *William III.* had agreed to *divide* the Spanish monarchy. After the death of *Charles II.*, 1700, *Louis* rejected the treaty and claimed the *whole* Spanish inheritance for *Philip of Anjou*. Philip of Anjou became **PHILIP V.** of Spain.

Members of the Grand Alliance: **AUSTRIA**, **ENGLAND** and **HOLLAND**, parts of the Empire (*Hanover*, *Brandenburg Palatinate*), 1701; *Portugal* and *Savoy*, 1703, against *France*, *Philip V. of Spain*, the Electors of Bavaria and Köln, the Duke of Mantua, and the Hungarian rebel Rakoczy.

Managers of the Alliance: Military: **EUGENE OF SAVOY**, the **DUKE OF MARLBOROUGH**; Diplomatic: **HEINSIUS**, *Pensionary of Holland*. The object of the Alliance was to secure the rights of the House of *Hapsburg*, and to prevent the union of the *French* and *Spanish* monarchies intended by Louis XIV.

Campaigns.	*Battles, etc.*	*Victory of*	*Results.*
In Germany, 1704.	**HÖCHSTÄDT** and **BLENHEIM.**	**EUGENE** and **MARLBOROUGH** over *Franco-Bavarians* (*Tallard*).	Germany was practically free of French troops and influence.
In the Netherlands, 1706.	**RAMILLIES.**	**MARLBOROUGH** over *Villeroi.*	The chief cities, all *Brabant* and nearly all *Flanders* taken by the allies.
n Italy, 1706.	**TURIN.**	**EUGENE** over *Marsin.*	Secured *northern Italy* and *Naples*, which was never again united with Spain.
In the Netherlands, 1708.	**OUDENARD.**	**EUGENE** and **MARLBOROUGH** over *Vendôme* and the *Duke of Burgundy.*	Reduction of *Lille*, the masterpiece of Vauban's fortifications.

CHIEF WARS OF THE PERIOD. — *Continued.*

In the Netherlands, 1709. | **MALPLAQUET** (bloodiest battle of the war). | **EUGENE** and *Marlborough* over **VILLARS.** | Fall of *Mons.* Revival of French courage and confidence.

In Spain, *Charles III*, after varying successes, was finally reduced to *Catalonia*, and left Spain in 1711, to assume the imperial dignity.

PEACE OF UTRECHT, 1713. (Separate treaties.)

1. *Philip V.* obtained *Spain* and the *West Indies*, and renounced his claim to the *French crown.*
2. *Louis XIV.* acknowledged the *Protestant Succession in England*, ceded her *Nova Scotia*, *Newfoundland* and the *Hudson Bay* territory (minus the fishery rights), and obtained the restoration of *Lille* and some other border towns.
3. *Spain* ceded to England *Minorca*, **GIBRALTAR** and the *Assiento*, the right to import slaves to America.
4. *Savoy* obtained the island of *Sicily* and an advantageous change of boundaries in *northern Italy.*
5. *Portugal* obtained a change of boundaries in *South America.*
6. *Prussia* obtained an increase of territory and the acknowledgment of the *royal title.*

PEACE OF RASTADT (with the *Emperor*) and **BADEN** (with the *Empire*), 1714.

1. *Austria* retained *Naples* (without *Sicily*), *Milan* and *Sardinia*, and obtained the *Spanish Netherlands*, after concluding a barrier treaty with *Holland.* No peace with Spain.
2. For the *Empire* the *Peace of Ryswick* was restored. The Electors of *Bavaria* and *Köln* were reinstated in their lands and dignities

THE TURKISH WARS OF LEOPOLD I., 1661-64 and 1682-1699.

Causes, etc.	*Battles.*	*Victory of*	*Conquests.*	*Treaties of Peace.*
1. Turkish aggressions in *Transylvania*.	**ST. GOTTHARD**, 1664.	Montecuculi over the Turks	Conquest of **GRAN**, 1683.	A *Truce* of 20 years between the *Emperor* and *Turkey*, 1664, gave to *Transylvania* freedom of electing its prince.
2. The rebellion of *Tököly*, a Hungarian chief, who declared himself a vassal of the *Sultan*.	**KAHLENBERG**. *Relief of Vienna*, 1683.	**JOHN III., SOBIESKI**, *K. of Poland*, **CHARLES V. OF LORRAINE** and their allied forces, over **KARA MUSTAFA**.	of *Neuhäusel*, 1685. of **BUDA**, 1686. of Morea and Dalmatia, by the Venetians, 1687. of Belgrade, 1688.	**PEACE OF CARLOWITZ** 1699. (1) The *Emperor* received *Hungary* and *Transylvania* in full sovereignty. (2) *Venice* received *Morea* and *Dalmatia*. (3) *Poland* received *Kameniec*. (4) *Russia* (*Czar Peter* allied with *Leopold I.* since 1696), obtained *Azow*.
3. The strong support which *Louis XIV.* gave both to the *Turks* and the *Hungarian* rebels.	**MOHACS**, 1687.	**CHARLES V. OF LORRAINE** over the *Turks*.		
4. The danger which threatened all Christendom on the part of *Mohammed IV.* and his Grand Vizier *Kara Mustafa*.	**SALANKEMEN**, 1691. **ZENTA**, 1697.	The *Christians* over *Mustafa Köprili*. **EUGENE OF SAVOY** over *Sultan Mustafa*.		
5. The enlightened zeal and splendid generosity of **INNOCENT XI.**, the founder and protector of the **HOLY LEAGUE: LEOPOLD I., JOHN III., SOBIESKI**, and the **REPUBLIC OF VENICE**.				

INDEX.

BOOK I.

CAUSES OF THE PROTESTANT REVOLUTION — THE RENAISSANCE.

CHAPTER I.

THE EXILE OF THE PAPACY AND THE GREAT WESTERN SCHISM.

PAGE

§ 1. The Suppression of the Templars 5
§ 2. The Empire from Adolf of Nassau to Ludwig the Bavarian 9
§ 3. Ludwig the Bavarian and the Court of Avignon . 12
§ 4. Charles IV. Return of the Papacy to Rome . . 16
§ 5. The Great Western Schism 19
§ 6. Attempts of a Re-union 23
§ 7. The Council of Pisa, 1409 27
§ 8. The Council of Constance, 1414–1418 . . . 30
§ 9. The Hussite Wars 34
§ 10. The Culmination and Collapse of the Pseudo-Conciliar Movement 37

CHAPTER II.

THE HUNDRED YEARS' WAR AND THE WAR OF THE ROSES.

§ 1. Edward II., 1307–1327 41
§ 2. Edward III. and Philip V. of Valois . . . 44
§ 3. Edward III. and John the Good, 1350–1364 . . 49
§ 4. Edward III. and Charles the Wise 52
§ 5. Richard II., 1377–1399 55
§ 6. The House of Lancaster, 1399–1461. Henry IV. and Henry V. 59

PAGE

§ 7. The Maid of Orleans. Fourth and Last Period of the Hundred Years' War 64
§ 8. Henry VI. The War of the Roses 68
§ 9. House of York. Edward IV. and Richard III. . . 71

Chronological Table—
Lancaster, York and Tudor 75

CHAPTER III.

CONSOLIDATION OF THE EUROPEAN MONARCHIES.

§ 1. Foundation of the Ottoman Empire 76
§ 2. The Defense of Europe 81
§ 3. Switzerland, Burgundy and France 84
§ 4. The Kingdoms of the Iberian Peninsula 88
§ 5. Henry VII. of England 94
§ 6. The Italian Wars 97
§ 7. The European Wars of the Holy League . . . 104

Chronological Tables—
The Papal Exile at Avignon 108
The Western Schism and the Conciliar Movement—
Popes after the Council of Constance 109
The Hundred Years' War 111
Kings in France and England 111
Events Preceding the Hundred Years' War . . . 111
Causes of the Hundred Years' War 112
Second Period—Civil War in England 113
Civil War in France—Third Period 114
Fourth Period—Epoch of Jean D'Arc 115
War of the Roses 115
Consolidation of European Monarchies 117

CHAPTER IV.

CHARACTER OF THE PERIOD.

§ 1. The Inquisition 120
§ 2. Universities 126
§ 3. The Renaissance 129
§ 4. Renaissance of Art and Politics 136
§ 5. Mediaeval Guilds 140
§ 6. The Eve of the Protestant Revolution . . . 146

BOOK II.

THE PROTESTANT REVOLUTION.

CHAPTER I.

THE AGE OF CHARLES V.

PAGE

§ 1. Luther's Fall 152
§ 2. The Diet of Worms 157
§ 3. The Social Revolution 159
§ 4. The Making of Protestantism 163
§ 5. First Wars of Charles V. 169
§ 6. The Diet of Augsburg and the Truce of Nürnberg . 172
§ 7. New Wars of Charles V. 175
§ 8. Treason of Maurice of Saxony and its Consequences . 179

CHAPTER II.

THE PROTESTANT REVOLUTION IN ENGLAND AND SCOTLAND.

§ 1. The Eve of the Revolution 183
§ 2. Henry VIII. and Cardinal Wolsey 188
§ 3. England Separated from Catholic Unity . . . 193
§ 4. "The Ruthless Tyrant" 196
§ 5. Edward VI., 1547–53 202
§ 6. Mary the Catholic, 1553–58 208
§ 7. Elisabeth's First Work in England and Scotland . . 213

CHAPTER III.

PROTESTANT REVOLUTION AND CATHOLIC REVIVAL.

§ 1. Effects of the Protestant Revolution 219
§ 2. The Catholic Revival 225

Chronological Tables —
The Prominent Popes of the Period 234
The Emperors — the Italian Wars 234

BOOK III.

THE WARS OF THE PROTESTANT REVOLUTION.

CHAPTER I.

THE HUGUENOT WARS IN FRANCE.

PAGE

§ 1. Formation of Parties 238
§ 2. The First Three Wars and the Massacre of St. Bartholomew's 244
§ 3. The Holy League and the War of the Three Henrys . 251
§ 4. Termination of the Struggle — Henry IV., the First Bourbon King, 1589–1610 255

CHAPTER II.

PHILIP II., MARY STUART AND ELISABETH.

§ 1. Philip II., King of Spain, 1555–98 258
§ 2. The Revolt of the Netherlands — Causes of Disaffection 263
§ 3. Administration of Margaret of Parma, 1559–67 . . 266
§ 4. Administration of the Duke of Alva, 1567–73 . . 270
§ 5. Don John and Alexander Farnese — Final Secession of the Netherlands 275
§ 6. Mary Stuart, Queen of Scots, 1542–87. Mary in Scotland, 1561–67 281
§ 7. Mary Stuart and Elisabeth 287
§ 8. Philip II. and Elisabeth 294
§ 9. Mexico, the Philippines, and the Spanish Colonies of South America 300
§ 10. The Portuguese in Brazil — Church and State in the Colonies 306

CHAPTER III.

THE THIRTY YEARS' WAR.

§ 1. Causes of the Thirty Years' War 313
§ 2. The Bohemian and Palatine War 319

PAGE

§ 3. The Danish War 324
§ 4. Gustavus Adolphus in Germany, 1630–32 . . 329
§ 5. Swedish War after the Death of Gustavus Adolphus . 335
§ 6. The Aggrandizement of France and the Franco-Swedish Period of the War 338
§ 7. The Peace of Westphalia 342
§ 8. Termination of the Franco-Spanish War . . . 345

Chronological Tables —
The Huguenot Wars 348
Chief Rulers of the Period 348
The Defection of the Netherlands — Administration of Margaret of Parma and the Duke of Alva 350
Administrations of Requesens, Don John of Austria and Alexander Farnese 351
The Thirty Years' War — Causes 351
The Bohemian War — The Palatine War — The Danish War, etc. 352
The Franco-Swedish War 354

CHAPTER IV.

THE PURITAN REVOLUTION.

§ 1. James I., 1603–1625 355
§ 2. Charles I. (1625–1649), and his first Parliaments . 361
§ 3. First Rumblings of the Civil War 364
§ 4. The Civil War 369
§ 5. Ireland under the Tudors and Stuarts 376
§ 6. The Insurrection of 1641 381
§ 7. Cromwell in Ireland 386
§ 8. The Commonwealth and Protectorate 391

CHAPTER V.

THE AGE OF LOUIS XIV.

§ 1. The Restoration of the Stuarts 396
§ 2. State of Europe at the Restoration of the Stuarts . 401
§ 3. Foreign Policy of Charles II. The First Anglo-Dutch War, 1665–67 404

PAGE

§ 4. Louis XIV. — The First War of Spoliation and the Treaty of Dover 406
§ 5. The Second War of Spoliation, 1672–79, and the Reunions, 1680–84 409
§ 6. England after the Peace of Nymwegen . . . 415
§ 7. James II., 1685–88 420
§ 8. The Second or Political Revolution . . . 424
§ 9. The Third War of Spoliation, or the War of the Palatine Succession, 1688–97 430
§ 10. The Campaign on the Continent and at Sea — Peace of Ryswick 434
§ 11. The Turkish Wars of Leopold I. 437
§ 12. Causes of the War of the Spanish Succession, 1701–14 443
Claimants to the Spanish Succession . . . 445
§ 13. The War of the Spanish Succession 448
§ 14. Treaties of Utrecht, Rastadt and Baden . . . 451
§ 15. The Church and the State — Summary . . . 455

Chronological Tables —
Chief Rulers of the Period 461
Chief Wars of the Period 461
The Anglo-Dutch War, 1665–67 461
Louis XIV.'s First War of Spoliation, Against the Spanish Netherlands, 1667–68 461
Second War of Spoliation, Against Holland, 1672–79 . 462
Third War of Spoliation, War of the Palatine Succession, 1688–97 462
The War of the Spanish Succession, 1701–14 . . 463
The Turkish Wars of Leopold I., 1661–64 and 1682–99 465

BENZIGER BROTHERS
Publishers & Booksellers
New York Cincinnati Chicago

95055

D
102
.G95
v. 2

95055

Guggenberger, Anthony

A general history of the Christian era.

D
102
.G95
v. 2

DATE	ISSUED TO

KLINCK MEMORIAL LIBRARY
Concordia College
River Forest, Illinois
60305